

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

W. Garland Richardson, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

Thomas L. Hughes, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general;

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Yugoslavia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary near the Government of Yugoslavia now established in London; and

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Greece, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary near the Government of Greece now established in London.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to move a recess until Monday at 12 o'clock noon. I hope at that hour to obtain the floor to address the Senate upon the amendment now pending. I therefore move, as in legislative session, that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, September 28, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 25 (legislative day of September 21), 1942:

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Harry W. Hill	James M. Irish
Claud A. Jones	Harold T. Smith
Alexander M. Charlton	Thomas B. Richey
Joseph J. Broshek	Charles L. Brand
Sydney M. Kraus	Ernest M. Pace, Jr.

To be medical directors

William Chambers
Kent C. Melhorn

To be pay directors

John F. Hatch
Emory D. Stanley
Fred E. McMillen

To be civil engineers

Henry G. Taylor
Gaylord Church

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Morton O. Bawner, Pensacola.
Dwight W. Shower, Safety Harbor.
Jerald W. Farr, Wauchula.

MINNESOTA

Elizabeth E. Trench, Dennison.
Aloysius I. Donahue, Elk River.
Dean M. Alderman, Grey Eagle.
Lee L. Champlin, Mankato.
Chester J. Gay, Moose Lake.
Elmer Backer, New Ulm.
Andrew Reid, South St. Paul.
Paul J. Arndt, Stillwater.
Daniel M. Coughlin, Waseca.

MISSOURI

Charles C. Oliver, Bloomfield.
Otis D. Kirkman, Cabool.
Harrison R. Porter, Conway.
Richard W. Marsden, De Soto.
Sadie G. Morehead, Milan.
Walter E. Duncan, Newburg.

NEBRASKA

Margarete C. Phelps, Valentine.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Joseph A. Gorman, Durham.
Willis E. Herbert, Franconia.
Richard U. Cogswell, Warner.

NORTH CAROLINA

William R. Young, Badin.
Berta B. White, Ellerbe.
Stephen C. Clark, High Point.
Robert T. Teague, Newland.

WISCONSIN

Arthur C. Finder, Ableman.
Perlee W. Dickey, Black River Falls.
Charles L. Haessly, Ellsworth.
John T. Tovey, Fremont.
Frank Heppie, Kewaskum.
May K. Powers, Lake Geneva.
Hildegard Thering, Plain.
Joseph P. Kelly, Richland Center.
Adelbert O. Randall, Rosendale.
Alfred H. Hadler, Thiensville.

SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, September 21, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Edwin J. Lee, A. M., pastor, St. Thomas More Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray: O Lord, who hast brought us through such vicissitudes of conflict

and adversity, be pleased to hear our prayer. Grant to these Senators of these United States the gift of wisdom, understanding, counsel, knowledge, piety, and fear of the Lord, that upon their hearts and their minds and even on their lips there may be emblazoned the slogan of the Crusaders of old, God wills it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, September 25, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SENATOR NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the people of Nebraska are to be congratulated. They have again demonstrated their wisdom and their patriotism. The press tells us that they have filed petitions qualifying the senior Senator from their State, Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, to run for reelection in the November elections, and calling on him to run.

The action of the people of Nebraska will be heartening to the people of the entire Nation. We in the Senate, of course, do not always agree with the Senator from Nebraska on all matters, but the action of the people of Nebraska is indeed heartening to us here.

A few weeks ago one of the leading publications in the country well spoke of Senator NORRIS as the conscience of the Senate. Through all the stress and storm of the years in which he has served in the Senate, his integrity has stood forth as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.

In this critical hour in the history of our country we need Senator NORRIS' services in the Senate more than ever. The very compulsion of the hour demands that he remain in the Senate. We need the example of his character and his courage; we need the wisdom of his counsel; we need the guidance of his leadership. I believe that I speak the sentiments of every Member of the Senate when I express the wish and the hope that Senator NORRIS may answer the urgent demand of the hour, that, like a soldier, he may respond to his country's call and continue his great service in the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

Aiken	Bone	Capper
Andrews	Brewster	Caraway
Austin	Bridges	Chandler
Bailey	Brooks	Chavez
Ball	Brown	Clark, Idaho
Bankhead	Bunker	Clark, Mo.
Barbour	Burton	Connally
Barkley	Butler	Danaher
Bilbo	Byrd	Davis

Downey	McCarran	Shipstead
Doxey	McFarland	Smathers
Ellender	McKellar	Smith
George	McNary	Spencer
Gerry	Maloney	Stewart
Gillette	Maybank	Taft
Green	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Guffey	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	Murray	Tobey
Hayden	Norris	Tunnell
Herring	Nye	Tydings
Hill	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Holman	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Johnson, Calif.	Overton	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Wallgren
Kilgore	Radcliffe	Walsh
La Follette	Reed	Wheeler
Langer	Reynolds	White
Lee	Rosier	Wiley
Lodge	Russell	Willis
Lucas	Schwartz	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] has been called to his State on important public business, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSAL TO PLACE OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA UNDER CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to place the Office of the Secretary of the Territory of Alaska under the classified civil service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PERSONNEL TRANSFERS BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

A letter from the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to section 204 of the act of July 25, 1942, a report on personnel transfers between the executive departments and agencies (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND (S. Doc. No. 248)

A letter from the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Twenty-first Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Petitions bearing the signatures of 37 citizens of the State of New York, 54 citizens of the State of Oregon, 28 citizens of the State of Rhode Island, and 314 citizens of the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by the Butler County (Kans.) Bankers Association, protesting against certain activities of production credit associations and the competition of such

associations with the banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Concordia, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask consent to present for appropriate reference three separate petitions from citizens of my State praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments.

I wish to make a brief statement so as to have reference appear in the body of the RECORD as to the presentation of these petitions.

The first petition is from members and friends of the Seventh-day Adventists Church of Walla Walla, Wash. The second is from a group of citizens in Everett, Wash. The third petition is from a group of citizens of my State residing in and about Elma, Wash.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Washington will be received and lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

H. R. 7121. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1617).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 2398. A bill authorizing the sale of certain parcels of land reserved for public purposes in the patent issued with respect to the town site of Fletcher, Okla.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1618);

S. 2635. A bill to provide for granting to the State of New Mexico the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in New Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 1619);

S. 2691. A bill to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1620);

H. R. 5719. A bill to abolish the Guilford Courthouse National Military Park Commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1621);

H. R. 6601. A bill to reorganize the system of land offices and land districts in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1622); and

H. R. 6657. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2723. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1624).

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2798. A bill amending the first sentence of Article of War 52, relative to execution of court-martial sentences; without amendment (Rept. No. 1625).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BONE:

S. 2806. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, so as to make insurance under such Act available to merchant seamen; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2807. A bill to extend to certain persons the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 2808. A bill to permit the prepayment of the purchase price of certain housing sold to individuals by the Farm Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2809. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn; to the Committee on Claims.

STABILIZATION OF THE COST OF LIVING—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GILLETTE submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to aid in stabilizing the cost of living, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RUBBER SUPPLIES AND PRODUCTION

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I shall divert the Senate but for a few moments to a subject which is equally vital to the Nation and to the Senate as is the pending question.

On March 5, 1942, the Senate adopted a resolution authorizing the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to set up a subcommittee for the purpose of making investigation into the general field of production, the means of production, and plans for production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, synthetic rubber, and particularly the utilization of some of our natural materials for those purposes.

The resolution was inspired by a feeling of the deepest concern on the part of the American people, and by a sense of the deepest responsibility resting upon Members of Congress, resulting from the interruption of our raw-rubber imports by disastrous military events in the western Pacific, and from a knowledge of the inadequacy of our supplies of natural and synthetic rubber.

The subcommittee conducted a searching investigation into the rubber situation. As the investigation progressed the subcommittee became aware that confusion was attending the too-slow progress being made by the War Production Board in utilizing new sources of rubber supply. It was progressively and increasingly astonished that some of the most promising sources of rubber, and some of the processes long used with success in other countries, were being entirely ignored by the various Federal agencies charged with alleviation of the rubber problem.

No committee ever labored more diligently, with more impartiality and honesty of purpose, or with more determination to render a real service to the country, than did this subcommittee composed

of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]—all men of time proven character and ability.

In the course of their investigation, they concluded that it was their duty to introduce and to sponsor in Congress a bill providing for the appointment of an administrator who would supervise production of the elements of synthetic rubber from agricultural and forest products, a process promising the most certain results in the shortest period of time and with the smallest consumption of money and critical materials. After careful consideration, and practically without opposition, the bill was passed by the Senate on July 22, and by the House of Representatives on July 24, of this year.

The President vetoed the measure on August 6, and at the same time announced the appointment of a committee consisting of Bernard M. Baruch, chairman, Dr. James B. Conant, and Dr. Karl T. Compton, to conduct a reinvestigation into the whole rubber situation, and to make recommendations of its own.

The Baruch committee submitted to the President on September 10 a report substantiating all findings of the Senate subcommittee headed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] as to errors, lack of understanding, and delays on the part of Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of solving the rubber problem. The Baruch committee also supported the Senate subcommittee's contentions that the Nation's rubber problem had been almost incredibly aggravated by the failure and refusal of Federal agencies to make use of proven processes for deriving rubber from agricultural and forest products. The Baruch committee recommended the appointment of an administrator to assume the responsibility of securing production of a rubber supply adequate for military and civilian needs.

The President thereupon authorized the appointment of Mr. William M. Jeffers, of Omaha, Nebr., president of the Union Pacific Railroad, as Rubber Administrator.

I have every hope that Mr. Jeffers will attempt to reach the goal cited in the Baruch committee's recommendations.

Whether the future program will include attainment of the purpose of the bill sponsored by the Senate subcommittee and passed by both Houses of Congress, that is, to produce rubber from agricultural and forest products, is yet to be developed.

In the meantime, action on the President's veto of the congressional measure is being held in abeyance.

I do not believe that Members of the Senate are of the opinion that the mere appointment of a rubber administrator relieves Congress of its responsibility to do everything within its power to attain an adequate rate of rubber production.

We have every hope that efforts to solve this problem, foremost of all our problems, will be attended by the fullest measure of success. But our responsibility as legislators will not have come to an end until that measure of success has been completely demonstrated in material achievement.

The American people are anxious to make whatever sacrifice may be required by the conditions of victory. They are determined to accept any restriction necessary to assure an adequate supply of rubber. They are therefore entitled to every assistance from the Congress and the executive departments which will fortify their faith in the wisdom of that determination.

Therefore, in order that we as Members of the Senate shall be enabled to determine when and if our responsibility shall have come to an end, I submit the resolution which I send forward and I ask that it be read by the clerk and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the resolution, and it will be referred as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The resolution (S. Res. 294) was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That the Federal Rubber Administrator is hereby requested to submit to the Senate at the earliest reasonable date within 30 days of passage of this resolution, and at 30-day intervals thereafter, a report of the status of rubber supplies and of the progress of rubber production within the United States, including a statement of—

(1) The total national supply of natural crude rubber, synthetic rubber, and rubber substitutes available to the Nation's armed services and civilian population.

(2) The total amount of natural crude rubber, synthetic rubber, and rubber substitutes under contract for future delivery to the United States from abroad.

(3) The number, capacities, and estimated costs of all plants designed to produce synthetic rubber and all elements of its composition; and the raw materials from which such rubber and its elements are to be made.

(4) The number, capacities, actual costs to date, and estimated costs of such plants construction of which has been started; the raw materials from which the elements of the finished products are to be derived; the dates upon which contracts were let, the dates upon which construction was started, and the estimated dates upon which construction will be completed; and the amounts of critical construction materials already consumed and estimated to be consumed in completion of such plants.

(5) The number, capacities, and estimated costs of such plants construction of which has not yet been started; the raw materials from which the elements of the finished products are to be derived; the dates upon which contracts were let and estimated dates of beginning and completing construction; and the estimated amounts of critical construction materials to be consumed.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on behalf of the eminent Senators with whom I have the privilege of being associated in the so-called rubber inquiry, I wish to sincerely thank the Senator from Indiana

for his very kind reference to the work of the members of the subcommittee.

I also wish to say that the Senator is to be congratulated for his grasp of the situation, and for pointing out, by the presentation of the resolution, the crisis which exists.

Those of us who have been rather active in connection with the rubber problem have been very much pleased with the selection of Mr. Jeffers. I may say, for the information of the Senate, that we have been in conference with Mr. Jeffers, and we are convinced that there will be no difficulty in working out the best solution possible for the interest of the country and all industries concerned.

I venture to assure the Senator that when the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry acts on the resolution which has just been offered, the statement of the committee will express appreciation of the interest he has evinced, and I am quite sure that within a very short time they will have a rather full statement to make on the floor of the Senate in connection with the subject matter.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator.

COMMODITY PRICES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 295) was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of commodity prices prevailing in the District of Columbia, with a particular view toward determining how prices paid by consumers for agricultural commodities, or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities, compare with the prices received by farmers for such agricultural commodities. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$3,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

THE PRESIDENT'S FARM PRICE PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BANKHEAD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address

on the subject Shall the President's Farm Price Program Be Adopted? delivered by Senator BANKHEAD in the Town Hall program, at Birmingham, Ala., on September 24, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER TO GOLD STAR MOTHERS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address to the Gold Star Mothers, delivered by him on September 27, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered in London on September 26, 1942, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEAT AND MILK SHORTAGES—ARTICLE BY A. S. GOSS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Swivel Chair Meddling," written by A. S. Goss, master of the National Grange, printed in the National Grange Monthly for October 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

STABILIZATION OF THE COST OF LIVING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to aid in stabilizing the cost of living.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment which is the pending question before the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 4, at the end of line 13, it is proposed to add the following:

For purposes of this section, parity prices and comparable prices for any agricultural commodity shall be determined as authorized by existing law but shall also include all farm labor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise this morning to begin what probably will be the last day of debate upon an amendment to a very important measure. So much has been said during the last several days as to this amendment, and there has been so much misunderstanding, that I wish to take a minute or two to describe the genesis of the so-called Tydings-Reed-O'Mahoney amendment which was offered last Wednesday. It is neither New Deal nor anti-New Deal; it is neither administration nor anti-administration; it is certainly not anti-farm bloc. As I have previously stated, I am a member of the farm bloc, an active and a vocal member, I hope, and shall continue to be so as long as I am in the Senate of the United States. No one but the people of Kansas, whose commission I hold, can deprive me of my membership in the farm bloc.

Before I proceed too far into my remarks I wish to say that I am absolutely in agreement with the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] in his statement that there is no inflation at this time. The general price level is now a little bit lower, a fraction of 1 percent lower, than it was in 1926, and it is the price level which determines the degree of inflation. If the present price level has exceeded that of

1926 at all in recent days, it has been by a very small fraction of 1 percent.

I wish to say further to the senior Senator from Oklahoma, whom I not only like, but for whose honesty, ability, and integrity I have a profound respect—and let me join with him the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], with whom I have discussed this question—that I share their desire to rewrite the parity formula now in the law. But for special reasons that is not now practicable.

When the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] came to my desk last Wednesday and asked me what I was engaged in doing, I told him I was trying to write an amendment to the pending joint resolution which would recognize the increased cost of production to the farmer. I told him that I also was desirous of keeping the joint resolution in substantially its present form, for the reason that for the first time it contained a direction to stabilize wages.

Many of us, beginning with the passage of the Price Control Act last year, and continuing to the enactment of the Price Control Act of 1942 last winter, desired that wages be included. They were not included only because of pressure from the administration. They are covered in the pending joint resolution. It is true that administrative discretion is left with the President and the Price Administrator, but I do not see how that can be avoided.

I wanted to have passed a measure which would be satisfactory to the President—at least sufficiently satisfactory so that it would be signed and would not precipitate a crisis at this time between the Congress and the White House. I can make that statement, as can the Senator from Maryland also, because I do not think anyone has listed among our many unlovely characteristics the charge that we are "rubber stamps" for anyone, not even the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I was elected to the Senate in 1938. In every speech I made to the people of Kansas in the campaign I said, "If you elect me to the Senate of the United States, I shall consult with my constituents, of course, and I shall be glad to have their advice, but in the last analysis I shall cast every vote upon my own conscience and my own judgment. I will not be a 'rubber stamp' for anyone, not even the President of the United States—not even if the President of the United States should be of my own party." I stand now on that declaration.

I desire to say earnestly to the Senator from Oklahoma—and to others who hold the same views he has expressed and I have expressed—that I should be very happy to join with them, for whatever it may be worth, either in this Congress or in the next Congress, to write a new parity formula for agriculture. So much for that.

There has been a vast amount of misrepresentation. I am a newspaperman, and have pride in my business—or call it

a profession, if you wish. I think it is most unfortunate, Mr. President, that the great metropolitan newspapers of the East are unable or unwilling to do justice to the farmer. They talk about the farmer and write about him as though he were a greedy individual seeking some undue advantage. We are apparently unable to get the facts into the metropolitan newspapers of the East. I adopt the language of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who recently said:

Recent attacks upon the American farmer, wafted to us in voices of the night from on high, obviously have not been harvested in the fields of fact. Nor have those fields of fact been within the ascertainable range of vision of the occupants of scores of metropolitan editorial chairs. History, past and current, reveals the American farmer in a more patriotic light than that which surrounds a group of critics whose possible charity of motive is ill-matched by their ignorance of fact, oversight of fact, or prostitution of fact.

The great metropolitan newspapers would be rendering their country greater service if they would find the space and have the inclination to publish the facts as they appear and as they exist.

Mr. President, there has been much said about increases in farm prices and in the cost of living as compared with increases in wages, and there has also been a discussion of the relative increase of wages and costs on the farm, as well as the increase in wages of the factory worker.

I hold in my hand a chart which was prepared for me by the Division of Statistical and Historical Research of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics since the Senate recessed last Friday. In graphic form the chart shows a great disparity between the increases of wages in the factory and the increases of wages on the farm. I should like to have the chart printed in the RECORD at this point; but I am informed that cannot be done without an order from the Joint Committee on Printing, which I have not had opportunity to obtain.

By the same source the chart was reduced to figures, in the form of a table, which supports the chart. I call attention to the salient figures of the table. Back in 1910 the average factory worker's wage was 20 cents an hour. In July 1942 it was 85 cents. That is an increase to 401.7 percent of the 1910-14 index. For the same period the average farm wage rate per day, without board, began in 1910 at \$1.39. It has increased to \$2.45, and in July of this year the index of farm wages was 196 percent of what it was in 1910. The factory worker had an index of 401.7 percent of his 1910 hourly rate.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I have read the amendment which the Senator from Kansas has proposed jointly with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I notice that the Senator from Kansas has stated the amend-

ment in the negative. I am wondering if the Senator would agree that in fixing ceiling prices for agriculture the farmer should receive the cost of production, and that it should be mandatory upon Mr. Henderson, or the Price Administration, to take into consideration the price of labor. Can the Senator see any objection to such a provision?

Mr. REED. I shall return to a discussion of the parity formula a little later.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not discussing at present the parity formula. I am merely asking the Senator if he does not believe that if ceiling prices are fixed on farm products, it should be mandatory upon Mr. Henderson, or upon the price-fixing authority, to give the farmer the cost of production, and include in it the increased cost in labor, plus a reasonable profit.

Mr. REED. That is required by the amendment at the present time, and I shall return to that point a little later, if the Senator from Montana will permit.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I cannot agree with him that that would be the result of his amendment, because it does not make it mandatory.

What I am seeking to know is whether the Senator from Kansas does not think the proposal should be stated affirmatively rather than negatively.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has not correctly stated the situation. The amendment which was originally prepared by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and myself and offered as an amendment to the amendment prepared by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], which had been accepted by the Committee on Banking and Currency and was incorporated in the joint resolution, is as follows:

That modifications shall be made—

Not may be made—

That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity—

I am omitting language which is not germane to the discussion—

in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs.

That is to say, where the ceiling price does not reflect those increased costs there shall be a modification which will do so. That is not stated in the negative.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if that is the interpretation which the Senator from Kansas puts upon his amendment, there could be no excuse for not stating it or any reason why it should not be stated in simple language that in fixing ceiling prices for agricultural products the cost of production should be taken into consideration, including the increased labor costs, whatever they may be.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana keeps bringing into the discussion the parity formula.

Mr. WHEELER. No; I am not speaking of the parity formula at all. I am not mentioning the parity formula. I am simply saying that if ceiling prices are fixed on agricultural products, the Price Administrator in fixing ceiling prices should, regardless of parity at all—let us eliminate parity entirely—take into consideration the cost of production of the commodity and should take into consideration the labor cost as well. Is there anything about parity in that suggestion?

Mr. REED. In the amendment which the Senator from Montana is supporting, or is reported to be supporting, there is a direction that the cost of labor be included in the parity price.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no.

Mr. REED. I beg the Senator's pardon. I yielded to the Senator, and I wish to be courteous to him—

Mr. WHEELER. I do not want the Senator from Kansas to put something in my mouth which is not correct, that is all. The Senator is mistaken in his interpretation. I am not talking about any proposed amendment. I am asking the Senator a direct question, regardless of any amendment that may be pending.

Mr. REED. The parity formula has never been a cost-of-production formula.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Later I shall discuss the parity formula, because I want it revised, but I want it revised at a time and under circumstances when we may consider all the factors which go into this all-important question. It is not now a cost-of-production requirement. It would not be under the Thomas-Hatch amendment. In that amendment it is undertaken to make labor costs a part of the parity formula and go further in that direction. I believe the farmer should have full recognition for his labor and other increased costs of production. That is what we are trying to get for him, without bringing about a collision with the President of the United States, which might result seriously.

Mr. WHEELER. No one wants to have a collision with the President of the United States. The Senator still has not answered my question. I say nothing about parity, for, to be candid, I feel that the parity price under the present formula is entirely unfair to the farmer in most circumstances. We should not stand upon parity which does not take labor costs into consideration. I am simply asking the Senator if, in this period when labor costs are higher, he does not think it proper when fixing ceiling prices to provide in simple concise language—

Mr. REED. I agree that the labor costs should be given consideration, and we have written into the proposed amendment a mandatory direction to whomever administrators and prescribes the price ceilings, to do that very thing.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. One or two objections occur to me with respect to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. The joint resolution as reported fixes the maximum price, which would be either the parity price or the highest price between January 1 and September 15.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator's amendment does not touch the provision at all.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. Under the joint resolution, if the Senator's amendment is adopted, this maximum price will be fixed on either one of those two bases. The Senator's amendment refers only to the modifications which may thereafter be made in respect to the price of agricultural products. In the modifications which may thereafter be made, whoever has in charge the administration of this measure, will take into consideration the increased cost of labor.

Mr. REED. And other costs.

Mr. OVERTON. And other costs, yes. But, as pointed out, I think by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Kansas in his amendment does not undertake at all to deal with the maximum price. The cost of labor is not included in the maximum price at all. The maximum price is fixed regardless of the cost of farm labor. It is only after the maximum price is fixed that the amendment suggests that modifications in the future shall take into consideration increased cost of farm labor.

Mr. REED. And other costs.

Mr. OVERTON. And other costs. There is another objection—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me inject a statement on the very point to which the Senator is adverting. Every maximum price fixed is a new maximum price, regardless of whether a maximum price has been previously fixed on a given commodity. If that maximum price is modified or changed then it becomes a new maximum. Even though it were a new maximum that were placed on a farm commodity, upon which a maximum has been heretofore fixed, in the fixing of the new maximum the increased cost of labor and other costs would be—not simply would be, but must be—taken into consideration.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct, Mr. President. The point I am making is that under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas and other Senators, the original maximum price has nothing whatsoever to do with the increase in cost.

Mr. BARKLEY. The maximum price fixed under the formula which is in the law, and which we do not disturb, may or may not, or might or might not, take into consideration increased cost of labor in the production of a given crop or a given commodity.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that so long as any crop is in the hands of the farmer upon

which a maximum price may be fixed, such maximum price, after it has been fixed, according to the rigid formula of parity, is to be modified to take care of any increase in the cost of labor producing the crop, whether it is in the future or in the past.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me ask the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] as one of the coauthors of the amendment if there would be any objection to stating, not merely the modification, but that the maximum price and modification thereafter made shall take into consideration increase in costs?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot answer the question on the spur of the moment.

Mr. OVERTON. What I want to do is to have the increased cost considered in first establishing the maximum price.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that would change the parity formula.

Mr. OVERTON. No; it has no reference whatsoever to parity. We leave the parity undisturbed, but for the purpose of this joint resolution—

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator's point. The maximum price under that proposal would be the parity as fixed by the formula, plus any addition that might be allowed because of increased cost of labor.

Mr. OVERTON. That is true.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator from Louisiana still desire to ask a question?

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator please.

Mr. REED. Has the Senator asked his question?

Mr. OVERTON. I have asked one, I think.

Mr. REED. At the present time the joint resolution, as it is before the Senate, authorizes the imposition of a maximum price, a ceiling, but not lower than parity or recent prices, whichever is higher. When that ceiling price is established our amendment requires—

That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity * * * in any case * * * where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity, the maximum prices so established—

That is, prices already established—will not reflect such increased costs.

If that is not a mandatory direction to recognize the increased labor costs, or the labor costs, then I do not know how to write one.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the able Senator from Kansas perhaps does not understand me, because I perhaps did not make clear the point I am undertaking to make. The amendment does not provide that the maximum price, when fixed, shall take into consideration the increased cost. The amendment starts with the parity formula, or with the highest price formula, and the amendment disregards the increased cost. Then, hereafter in the future, modifications which may be made, will take into consideration increased costs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think a complete answer to what the Senator from Louisiana says is that the parity formula has never been regarded here-

before as a cost-of-production formula. I do not want to wander too far off into a discussion of the parity formula.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not asking that the Senator do so.

Mr. REED. Just a moment, if I may finish. It might be constructed upon any one of three or four different premises or bases. Heretofore the parity formula has never been constructed on a cost-of-production basis. We have before us now a joint resolution which continues the present law, so far as parity is concerned. It does order the ceiling price to be either parity or the recent price, whichever is higher. In addition to that, however, the President is directed by the use of the word "shall" to include—and let me read it again—

That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity * * * in any case * * * where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs.

Mr. OVERTON. That is also clear, and the amendment suggested by the Senator does not disturb the parity formula.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. Neither does the modification of his amendment suggested by me. The only difference between us on this particular point is that I suggest that the maximum price, when originally established under the joint resolution, shall take into consideration existing increased costs of farm labor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Louisiana has exactly stated the correct position. The Senator from Kansas states a negative proposition. Why can he not state it in the affirmative?

Mr. REED. I am afraid I should be wholly unable to furnish the distinguished Senator from New Mexico with a satisfactory reason why his amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. HATCH. I understand that; but I am really trying to get results. I am not interested in words or language. In fact, I am lost in the maze of words which appear in these amendments. I have tried to state a simple proposition reasonably and simply.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and I took the language of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], already accepted by the committee and incorporated in the joint resolution; and we have tried to protect the farmer in respect to his increased labor and other costs. We are very certain that we have succeeded. Far be it from me to say that the proposition could not be stated in some other way. It is stated in this way. I insist that under the language of this amendment the farmer would be protected in any ceiling price which

might be fixed, in his parity price, or his higher price, with respect to any increased cost of labor or other costs.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to have the Senator come back 6 months from now and tell us whether he is satisfied with the present formula.

Mr. REED. I do not like the present formula. I have already stated that at any time in the future, in this session of Congress or in the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I shall be glad to join in revising the formula.

I am sure that the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New Mexico will be back here. Not having to come up for reelection, I shall be here.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Over the week end I worked as hard as I know how to work to try to find some reasonable solution to this problem. In substance I said that the farmer should be entitled to receive the production cost of the articles which he produces. Is there any objection to that?

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to discuss that question later. If I may proceed, I intend to recur later to the question of the formula.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield to my friend the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. I know how sincerely and honestly the Senator from Kansas has approached this problem, and the purpose and motive behind the presentation of the amendment to which he has been addressing his discussion; but I should like to ask him, as a practical matter, how it could be worked. I preface my question with the statement that under the provisions of the joint resolution now pending the President may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by the joint resolution through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct.

Referring to the amendment presented by the able Senator and his co-sponsors, I read:

That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs.

Who is to determine the question, when is it to be determined, how is it to be determined, and what weight is to be given to the various factors? What agency is to administer the authority?

Under the Thomas amendment there is a definite fixation of authority which is to take into consideration the factor of labor costs. Under the amendment of the esteemed Senator and his collaborators, I ask him what agency is to do it, how is it to do it, when is it to do it, and what weight is to be given?

Mr. REED. I am glad to answer the Senator from Iowa. All through the joint resolution, as in the previous price-control measures, there has been a large delegation of authority. There is no greater delegation of authority in this joint resolution than appears in the two previous so-called price-control measures. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics keeps a constant check on prices and costs and reports them every month, so that information is always available. That is an executive department, directly under the control of the President. The President may be sure that if he or his Price Administrator does not reflect increased costs from month to month, or at such times as readjustments may be advisable, when the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shows the costs, the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Montana, the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Alabama, or the Senator from Kansas will rise on this floor and ask, "How do you get that way?" Here is a plain direction to the President, written into the joint resolution, to do these things and to take into consideration labor and other costs.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator be courteous enough to yield to me once more?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. Is it not conceivable that before these facts are apparent and before the machinery to which the Senator has just referred is placed in motion and revolves sufficiently to bring results to the farmer or producer who has his crop ready to market, the marketing period will have passed?

Mr. REED. I am sure that the Senator from Iowa is so familiar with these things that he shares my feeling and belief—perhaps I might use the word, say, "hope"—that the President or his Price Administrator will move promptly. Certainly, if they do not do so, I shall be the first Senator to join any other Senator or group of Senators in ascertaining the reason for delay.

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course, I share that hope; and, of course, I am convinced that the executive department will be prompt; but the fact remains that under the Thomas amendment there is the placing of a definite authority under which action could be taken before the crisis arises. In the case envisioned by the amendment presented by the able Senator, it all depends on action taken in the future, if and when taken.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from Iowa that there is no need for a lag greater than 30 days. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the Department of Agriculture states these facts every 30 days. Let me say to the Senator from Iowa that if the Senator from Okla-

homa were willing to allow us to vote upon this amendment first, if this amendment should fail, I am so much interested in obtaining justice for the farmer that I should vote for the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from New Mexico. I think this is the best way to obtain it. If the Senate does not agree with me, and if upon a vote on this amendment preceding a vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma this amendment should fail, I would vote for the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma and ask every Senator who attaches any importance whatever to my opinion on these matters to join me in that vote. This is a practical solution to the problem. I shall come back to that question a little later.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement showing the average hourly earnings of factory workers and the average farm wage rate per diem in the United States from 1910 to date; also a table showing farm wage rates and hourly earnings of factory workers in the United States, by quarters, from January 1935 to date.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average hourly earnings of factory workers and farm-wage rate per day without board, United States, by years, 1910 to date

Year	Average hourly earnings of factory workers ¹	Average farm wage rate per day without board	Index of farm wage rates ²	Index of hourly earnings of factory workers
	Dollars	Dollars	(1910-14=100)	
1910.....	0.200	1.39	97	94.5
1911.....	.203	1.39	98	96.0
1912.....	.212	1.43	101	100.3
1913.....	.221	1.46	103	104.3
1914.....	.223	1.43	101	105.5
1915.....	.229	1.44	103	108.3
1916.....	.261	1.58	113	123.3
1917.....	.311	1.98	141	147.1
1918.....	.408	2.54	177	192.3
1919.....	.477	3.03	207	225.6
1920.....	.578	3.46	242	273.3
1921.....	.506	2.12	155	239.1
1922.....	.464	2.07	151	219.3
1923.....	.520	2.25	169	245.7
1924.....	.545	2.29	173	257.5
1925.....	.544	2.29	176	257.2
1926.....	.548	2.31	179	258.9
1927.....	.552	2.28	179	260.9
1928.....	.560	2.27	179	264.7
1929.....	.566	2.25	180	267.5
1930.....	.552	2.08	167	260.9
1931.....	.517	1.62	130	244.3
1932.....	.458	1.20	96	216.4
1933.....	.455	1.11	85	214.9
1934.....	.541	1.26	95	255.7
1935.....	.559	1.33	103	264.1
1936.....	.564	1.42	111	268.7
1937.....	.634	1.61	126	299.7
1938.....	.639	1.58	125	302.0
1939.....	.644	1.56	123	304.3
1940.....	.670	1.59	126	316.7
1941.....	.736	1.93	154	348.0
1942, July.....	.850	2.45	196	401.7

¹ Reported by Bureau of Labor Statistics from 1932 to date; prior to 1932 converted to dollar figure from index.

² Based on farm wage rates per month with and without board and farm wages per day with and without board converted to a monthly basis. From these 4 wage rates a composite wage rate is secured by averaging the 4 rates together with regional weights based on the percentage of farm workers who are paid by the month with board and without board and by the day with and without board.

Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Farm-wage rates and hourly earnings of factory workers, United States, by quarters, January 1935 to date

(Index numbers (1910-14=100))

Year and month	Farm wage rates		Hourly earnings of factory workers	
	Unadjusted	Adjusted for seasonal variation		
				Cents
1935:				
January.....	93	97	263.2	55.7
April.....	100	102	265.5	56.2
July.....	106	103	264.1	55.9
October.....	108	105	262.4	55.5
1936:				
January.....	100	104	266.1	56.3
April.....	106	108	266.1	56.3
July.....	114	111	265.5	56.2
October.....	116	113	265.5	56.2
1937:				
January.....	110	115	277.3	58.7
April.....	120	122	297.4	62.0
July.....	131	127	306.3	64.8
October.....	134	130	309.5	65.5
1938:				
January.....	118	123	308.0	65.2
April.....	121	123	303.4	64.2
July.....	129	125	298.3	63.1
October.....	126	122	299.7	63.4
1939:				
January.....	117	122	304.3	64.4
April.....	121	123	303.4	64.2
July.....	126	122	301.1	63.7
October.....	126	122	305.5	64.6
1940:				
January.....	119	124	313.2	66.3
April.....	124	127	314.4	66.5
July.....	129	125	315.2	66.7
October.....	129	125	318.1	67.3
1941:				
January.....	124	129	325.6	68.9
April.....	138	141	334.5	70.8
July.....	160	155	351.7	74.4
October.....	165	160	363.8	77.0
1942:				
January.....	166	173	378.4	80.1
April.....	177	181	387.1	81.9
July.....	202	196	401.7	85.0

Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Hourly earnings of factory workers compiled from reports of Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before I overlook it, I wish to say that, as one of the coauthors of this amendment, I am perfectly willing to accept a definite date in the amendment from which the increased costs shall be computed. I cannot give a final answer committing my associates, including the majority leader. This idea was conceived by me and worked out by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and myself. We conferred at that time with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and other Senators. I am willing to put in a date from which the increased costs shall be computed.

The other day the senior Senator from Georgia called attention to that omission; I stated then that I was willing to have such a date put in. I repeat the statement today. I think it advisable before final action on the amendment be taken, that we include a date from which the increased costs shall be computed.

Mr. President, I have in my hand an index of wholesale prices of all commodities and the cost of living, by years,

from 1910 to 1942. I shall not take much time on this matter, but I desire to call attention to the unnecessary fear which has been instilled in the minds of the people of the country and, to me, the needless alarm which has been created by the language used by the President of the United States in his message on Labor Day. The facts, as I discussed them in the Senate last week, do not justify such fear or alarm. The table which I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD shows how needless such fear or alarm is when the data are brought down to the nearest date—August of this year—for which we can have statistics. From January of this year to August of this year wholesale prices of all commodities rose from an index of 140.1 percent, in January, to 144.8 percent—an increase of 4.7 points in the index of wholesale prices.

As is known by those familiar with these matters, the cost of living rises more slowly and falls more slowly than does the index of wholesale prices; wholesale prices move faster than does the cost of living. In January of this year the cost of living was 162.3, and in August it was 170.1. In the interval from January to August the cost of living increased only 5 percent. There is a difference of 8 points between the index figures, but those 8 points are to be applied to a base of 162. That is one-twentieth, and the cost of living has actually increased only 5 percent. The table to which I refer was prepared for me by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics since the recess of the Senate last Friday and was handed to me this morning. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Indexes of wholesale prices of all commodities and cost of living, by years, 1910-42
[1910-14=100]

	Whole-sale prices of all commodities	Cost of living
1910.....	102.8	95.5
1911.....	94.7	98.6
1912.....	100.9	99.7
1913.....	101.9	102.5
1914.....	99.4	104.1
1915.....	101.5	105.1
1916.....	124.8	112.9
1917.....	171.5	132.8
1918.....	191.7	155.8
1919.....	202.3	179.4
1920.....	225.4	207.2
1921.....	142.5	185.1
1922.....	141.2	173.5
1923.....	146.9	176.7
1924.....	143.2	177.1
1925.....	151.1	181.7
1926.....	146.0	183.2
1927.....	139.3	179.7
1928.....	141.2	177.7
1929.....	139.1	177.5
1930.....	126.1	173.0
1931.....	106.6	157.5
1932.....	94.6	141.4
1933.....	96.2	133.9
1934.....	109.3	138.7
1935.....	116.8	142.2
1936.....	118.0	143.6
1937.....	126.0	148.8
1938.....	114.7	146.1
1939.....	112.6	144.1
1940.....	114.7	145.2
1941.....	127.4	152.5

Indexes of wholesale prices of all commodities and cost of living, by years, 1910-42—Con.
[1910-14=100]

	Whole-sale prices of all commodities	Cost of living
1942:		
January.....	140.1	162.3
February.....	141.2	163.6
March.....	142.5	165.7
April.....	144.1	166.8
May.....	144.2	168.1
June.....	143.9	168.7
July.....	144.1	169.4
August.....	144.8	170.1

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Division of Statistical and Historical Research.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator the meaning of the 5 percent to which he has referred.

Mr. REED. The 5 percent figure applies to the increase in the cost of living between January 1942 and August 1942. In January the base index figure was 162.3. By August it had risen to 170.1—an increase of 5 percent. The increase is 8 points, but that is 5 percent of the base.

Mr. President, I have about concluded. I have come to what I want to say finally. There are three things which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and I discussed at my desk when we prepared the amendment last Wednesday. First, we wanted to give the farmer protection against his increasing costs of production, whether they be labor costs or other costs. I think we have done that. We have done it as well as earnest men can do a job.

Secondly, we preferred this method because we are told on fair authority, I think, that this method included in the joint resolution would be acceptable to the President of the United States. We prefer it that way because for the first time the joint resolution contains a direction to the President to take notice of wages and to stabilize them. That is what we have been asking for all this time. For more than a year Senators on this floor, including myself, have pointed out the futility of trying to control prices without controlling wages, which constitute the largest factor relating to all costs.

Thirdly, Mr. President, this is no time to bring on a needless conflict with the President of the United States. This is no time, if it can be avoided, to bring about a controversy over perhaps some constitutional power. If we can secure protection of the farmer without such unnecessary conflict, why not do so? We can do so, so I am told. The amendment, as drawn, even including a date, which I am willing to put in, is still not unacceptable to the President. He has said that the other form would be unacceptable. I am no rubber stamp for the President; God knows, everyone should know that. However, I want to use common sense; I do not want to invite unnecessary controversy.

We are about to do an important thing here today. We are in the midst

of a world war, and here is a crisis. If we were to bring on an unnecessary conflict between the President and Congress, we should be doing something unnecessary and, to me, unwise. I appeal to the Senate not to do so.

A thousand years ago a learned Persian wrote the following lines, lines which have truth today as well as then:

The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on; nor all your Piety nor Wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.

Mr. President, whenever the question comes to a vote I hope there will be no action which will call for cancellation, and no word used which will need tears to wash it out.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas a question before he takes his seat.

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator's substitute would accomplish the result he describes, what is the difference between that result and the result which would be accomplished by the Thomas amendment?

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that, practically, the difference between them is the difference between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I thought.

Mr. REED. A great face-saving race is now going on. The farm organization leaders, who have gotten rather far out on a limb, want to save their faces. Not being an administration confidant, I say from my own knowledge that the administration wants to save its face. I am willing to have both of them save their own faces.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I desire to speak only briefly about the problem which has been under consideration on the floor of the Senate for some time, and which is of the greatest importance, not merely to one section or to one class of this country but to every man, woman, and child. That problem is the question of our national food supply.

I shall not talk about the rights and interests of the farmers. Heretofore I have spoken for the farmers often enough, and they know that my sympathies still lie with them, without being told again. Neither shall I discuss the equities of the President's proposals on price fixing. The able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and many other Senators have shown clearly how unjust are the present price and wage relationships which the administration proposes to freeze. Surely no fair-minded person can believe any longer that farmers are profiteering from the war effort. Surely no one can doubt now that under the present economic set-up the farmers still have the short end of the deal.

However, that is not what I wish to emphasize today. Those problems—problems of price relationships and of differences in living standards—are important, but they are no longer our major problems. If nothing else were at stake in this controversy than the rights of the farmers, I should be in-

clined to go along with the wishes of the administration; but what is at stake—the question of our national food supply—is vastly more important.

The blunt fact is that at the present time our farm workers—seasonal labor, hired men, farm boys and girls, and even farm operators—are being drained off the farms by the Army and by the unreasonably high wages of war industries and other manufacturing plants. Nothing we have been able to do to date has stopped or even halted that trend.

That fact, I believe, has been recognized by every responsible official of the Government. Only a few days ago, Secretary Wickard made a special appearance before a House committee to deal with that subject. At that time he stated:

Assuming an Army of 8,000,000, it is estimated that agriculture will lose 1,000,000 persons from its working force before July 1, 1943. By the end of the 1943 harvest season, the total drain upon agriculture will, of course, increase proportionately.

Those estimates, says Secretary Wickard, are altogether conservative.

Mr. Fred Wallace, Triple A Administrator, is not conservative. In a recent magazine article, he speaks of two and a quarter million men from the farms for an Army of 10,000,000; and that does not include those who will go into industry. In Nebraska it is estimated that for each man entering the armed services, two more go into defense work.

I could give many examples which would bring the situation vividly and dramatically before the Senate. Every day I receive letters from persons in my State, many of whom are not farmers themselves, but who write merely as public-spirited citizens, calling attention to the danger to our food supply. One friend, a former Governor of Nebraska, has given me a list of the operators of the 20 ranches located within a 7-mile radius of his own. In nearly every case the ranches are operated by or with the help of men of draft age. Labor is almost impossible to hire at rates which the operators can afford to pay. Six of them operate on their own, and have no children. When they are called, their ranching operations will be discontinued. Six more, having children, are so essential in the work they are doing that when they are called, the herds will be dispersed or greatly reduced. The approximate number of cows carried on these ranches is 4,350. I estimate that when the married men of draft age referred to are called, the number of cows continuing to be run will be reduced to not over 2,300. My friend concludes his summary by stating "the facts recited have no exceptional application to the community mentioned. They exist throughout the entire range country."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield at that point?

Mr. BUTLER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask my colleague if the condition which he has so well described—and I think the description is accurate—will be affected in any way by the particular legislation now pending. If we adopt either one of the pending contested amendments, what ef-

fect will it have upon the drafting service when they are taking into the Army men they ought to leave on the farm?

Mr. BUTLER. My object in bringing attention to the situation is merely to emphasize the importance of the food supply which the farmers of the Nation are providing.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with my colleague that it is a condition which must be remedied; I agree with every word he has said about the danger of a food shortage; but I cannot see how either one of the pending amendments will affect the situation. If there are taken from the farm and placed in the Army men who ought to be on the farm in order to produce the food which is necessary, the food will not be produced; the land will lie idle, and farm operations, to a very great extent, will have to cease.

Mr. BUTLER. In the illustration I am using, the connection is that if the food supply is to be provided, as it must be, or else we lose the war, farm workers cannot be obtained without paying wages which are comparable to the wages being paid in industry.

Mr. NORRIS. If all the men are taken by the Army, what difference will it make how much wages are paid if the men are not there?

Mr. BUTLER. With my colleague, I think that it would make a great deal of difference.

Mr. President, no such mass migration from the farms can occur without causing a food shortage. That should be obvious to everyone. I do not think consumers realize how extremely fortunate they have been because of the favorable weather which has prevailed this year. Good pastures and good crops have helped provide record yields and have prevented really serious shortages from developing, but we would be fools to count on such favorable weather again. Remember that it is the food supply for the East and the great industrial centers about which I am talking. It is only the surplus from the farming regions that goes to the consuming centers. The farmers will still be growing enough for themselves and their families long after city consumers have gone on short rations.

So the problem of keeping the laborer on the farm is a national problem, not a farm problem. I do not know how it can be done, other than by paying him as much as he could earn elsewhere; and I do not know how the farmer can do that unless the price he receives covers his costs. I suppose the Government could freeze labor on the farms, if it had the conscience to force a man to labor for 30 cents an hour producing cheap food for his brother in the city, who makes 75 cents to a dollar or more an hour. We could probably pass such a law, if we are willing to consider anything so radically unfair, but I do not know that the labor we would get in that way would be worth anything.

Personally, at this time of crisis I do not like to have to stand here and talk about the interests of the farmer or any other particular class. I would rather not support a measure sponsored by

some one economic group, no matter how thoroughly justified their request, against the wishes of our Commander in Chief. But the responsibility of the farmers of this country for feeding this Nation and our Allies is tremendous. I wish the cities could grow their own food, so that our farmers could be free to do the fighting. But we cannot dodge our responsibility. The farmers must have competent labor to help them; and I do not know how they can get it unless they can find the money with which to pay farm labor what it can earn somewhere else.

If the administration could give some assurance that adequate steps would be taken, without raiding the Federal Treasury, to make the necessary labor supply available, I should be content to go along with the administration's program. But no such assurance has been given, and I am afraid it cannot be given. Secretary Wickard, in his testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture the other day, made a number of excellent suggestions in outlining the Department of Agriculture's program. It is clear that many officials of the Department have given a great deal of study to the problem. But after he had concluded, it was still clear that there was no reason to expect that the steady drain of farm workers into industry and into the Army would be stopped.

Too many of the suggestions with respect to this problem are either the product of wishful thinking or relate to makeshift arrangements which cannot possibly fill the gap. Secretary Wickard suggested, for example, that war industries should recruit more of their workers from the cities instead of from the farms. That is a splendid idea, but how is it to be done? What can keep a man on the farm if he knows he can make five times as much in a munitions factory? The Secretary of Agriculture also urged deferment of as many experienced farm managers as possible. That would be excellent, but many of us have been urging that for a year or more, and nothing has come of our urgings to date. Then he fell back on the makeshifts. If experienced, able-bodied men are moving to the cities, inexperienced city men, women, and children must be trained and sent to the farm, according to the plans of the Department of Agriculture.

It must be obvious that none of these approaches faces the problem frankly. We might as well be clear-headed about it. It is idle merely to hope that things will turn out all right. Farm work demands the strength of an able-bodied man. It requires the experience and skill of a trained worker, born and bred on the farm. It cannot be learned in a few minutes or a few weeks, and most of it must be done without direct supervision. On the other hand, many industrial operations are routine, can be quickly learned, do not require physical strength, and are carried on directly under the eye of a foreman. Such jobs in manufacturing and distribution are the ones that can be filled by city men, women, and children, but experienced and essential men must be left on the farms if our people are to have enough to eat.

Mr. President, I know we must expect shortages of many things. It is not possible to raise an army of the size we are contemplating and equip it with the modern machines of war without draining labor and materials and everything else from civilian industries. But should labor for the war effort be drawn from the farms first? We can get along for a long time on last year's house, last year's furniture, and last year's bric-a-brac, but we cannot even do one good day's work on yesterday's food. The farm is, in fact, the one place where we dare not risk a shortage of labor. Yet agriculture's requirements for labor seem to be the last to be considered, and it is only agriculture that is required to make out with stop-gaps and makeshifts.

Practically speaking, I think we shall all soon realize that the question is not, Shall we keep men on the farms? The declining stream of food to the cities will answer that question for us. I strongly suspect that it will be the cities where the pinch will be felt first and that the cities will demand most earnestly that experienced farmers be sent back to the farms to produce what the cities most need. When that day comes, we shall stop worrying about parity or the price of this or that, and try to answer the more fundamental question, How is the farm-labor force to be maintained? Shall we force farm workers to go back and work at one-third the wages they could make in industry? Or shall we make up the difference in Federal subsidies? Or shall we expect the consumer to pay the farmer at least what it costs to produce the food?

I do not think we shall try to force any man to work at less than a fair wage, by freezing him on the farm or by any other means. No person denies the fact that farm wages are far below those of industry. As a practical matter, I think we shall have to choose between (1) letting the Government pay the difference through subsidy, or (2) requiring the consumer to pay the cost of production. The plain fact is that the consumer at the present time is in a far better position to pay than the Government which may have already assumed more burdens than it can bear. My vote for the Thomas amendment, therefore, is a vote against the new Government subsidies which will have to be provided if returns to the farmer are to cover costs. Farmers are pretty tired of Government subsidies and pretty tired of being accused of raiding the Treasury. All they ask is a price to cover their costs and to give them a subsistence income for the duration of this war. That is all the pending amendment provides. For that reason, I shall support the Thomas-Hatch amendment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address I broadcast over the radio last night touching on the subject matter of pending joint resolution, as well as a number of telegrams I have received in relation to the same subject.

There being no objection, the address and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How do you do, ladies and gentlemen, and hello there, boys and girls. This is Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas, speaking direct from your Nation's Capital, Washington, D. C. I am glad to have this opportunity to discuss with you a matter of vital importance to our Nation. It is Senate Joint Resolution No. 161, referred to sometimes as the second price control bill, or an antiinflation bill. This is part of the legislation that our Chief Executive told us we must enact before October 1, or he would act himself. That statement by our President has aroused much comment.

Now it may be that I do not have in my possession a late, revised copy of the Constitution of the United States, but according to the copy which I do have, the authority to make laws still rests in the hands of the legislative department of government and not in the executive department of government, and I want to state plainly that it is my opinion that any basic change in our form of government should be accomplished by the action of the majority of our citizens, and until such action by the people has been taken, I intend to continue to discharge my duties as a United States Senator in strict accordance with our Constitution. Some people who believe in using the war emergency to put over social reforms and class legislation may try to make us believe that this pending legislation is a war measure. I cannot classify it as a war measure because I know that we could fight a foreign enemy whether we enacted this piece of legislation or not. As proof of this contention, I point to the fact that we have fought several wars before without having such legislation—and incidentally, we won those wars.

I am not adverse to giving post-war conditions and possibilities some consideration now, but I believe it would be wise for the Congress to be more deliberative in considering such important measures and not try to rush them through under the guise of war measures. While, in my opinion, this price-control bill is not a war measure, yet I realize of course that almost every piece of legislation enacted now, and almost everything we do may have some effect on the war. The main issue in this bill now pending is whether we will deal as fairly with our great agricultural classes of our population as we have dealt with other classes. I objected to price control when it was originally presented several months ago because I was of the opinion that to inaugurate a system of controlling prices through orders issued by some Government bureau would result in building one of the largest departments the Government had ever had and that this department would absolutely hold the power of life and death over all American business. Incidentally, it also has its political implications and dangers. I expressed the opinion that if, instead of attempting to control prices by bureaucratic board orders, we would proceed to pass an adequate tax bill and allow the Government to recapture all excess earnings of corporations and all excess earnings of individuals, we need not have any grave fears, at least for the immediate future, insofar as inflation was concerned. I also objected to the original price-control bill because I considered it very unfair to our great agricultural population, and I voted for the final enactment of that legislation only after working with some of the Senators and getting some protective amendments included which were more favorable to the farmers and ranchers of our Nation. We are now told that the original Price Control Act which we passed is inadequate. We are told that our

agricultural population must be further penalized by reducing the maximum price limits on agricultural products. It seems to me, however, simple justice requires that in any effort to stabilize prices, the farmers, the cattle raisers, the sheep and goat raisers, the dairymen, poultry raisers, and those who produce fruits and vegetables should be given a fair deal. The main controversy in the pending measure is whether the maximum prices of farm products shall be restricted to 100 percent of so-called parity or permitted to sell high enough to return to the producer the cost of farm labor necessary to produce such farm products. It is certainly my opinion that it is only honest and fair for those prices to include the cost of labor employed in producing such products.

Our Government makes contracts with industrialists for the production of buildings and war weapons on a cost-plus basis, which means that the Government pays the cost of everything entering into the manufacture of the finished product, including the cost of all labor, and then on top of that pays the producers a profit. Our farmers are not asking for a cost-plus contract to produce the food and clothing needed for our armies, our civilian population, and for our Allies. They are willing to produce the food and clothing at cost, but the proponents of this price-control bill want to use "parity prices," and the present formula for determining "parity prices" does not include the cost of farm labor. It sounds preposterous that a formula for figuring farm-product prices would be established that left out of the computation the cost of such an important factor of cost as farm labor, yet that is the fact. As proof of that statement, I refer you to the exact words of one of our best informed Senators made on the floor of the Senate as follows: "The present parity formula is only a principle. There is no law vitalizing that principle. The parity principle is stated in the broadest language. It merely includes interest, taxes, and freight rates. It does not include labor."

Now I ask all of you businessmen who are familiar with figuring costs to visualize a cost system to determine the price of wheat, oats, corn, beef cattle, cotton, and other farm products that employs a principle that merely includes interest, taxes, and freight rates, and does not include the cost of labor. The big controversy in the Senate is therefore over the adoption of what is known as the Thomas-Hatch amendment, and in order that you may be sure to understand exactly what this Thomas-Hatch amendment is, I will read it to you. Here it is: "For purposes of this section, parity prices and comparable prices for any agricultural commodity shall be determined as authorized by existing law, but shall also include all farm labor." Now, friends, I am in favor of that Thomas-Hatch amendment because I think it is only fair that the cost of farm labor should be included in the cost of farm products. I am also in favor of it because if the cost of farm labor is not included, our farmers simply cannot continue to operate the farms and produce the food and clothing, and the time may come when we will have a serious shortage of something to eat, and something to wear.

I would like to take time here to give you some facts and figures which prove that the farmers of this Nation are not financially able to hire labor to raise food and stand the loss themselves. The figures are really astonishing, but they are authentic as published by the United States Government. In the year 1910, 35.1 percent of our population lived on farms. Today only 22.5 percent live on farms—the lowest percentage in our history. Since 1910 our population has increased from 91,000,000 to 132,000,000. Today our lowest percentage of farm population in his-

tory is expected to feed and clothe the largest population in the history of our Nation, and in addition to that, these few farmers are expected to provide food and clothes for many of our allies in this war. This migration from the farms of this Nation was caused simply because those farmers could not make a living on the farms, and they had to go elsewhere to make a living. Our farm population is also in the lowest income brackets. It is indeed shocking to look at the statistics. The per capita income of our farm population for the 23 years from 1910 to 1932, inclusive, totaled only \$4.191, while the per capita income of our nonfarm population for the same period of time was \$15.494. This gave the farmer only 21.2 percent and the non-farmer 78.8 percent. That starvation income, friends, was so low and so ridiculous that our Federal Government in 1933 set up a system of parity prices and parity payments to farmers intended to benefit our farm population and although our Federal Government has paid out on this farm program \$3,358,000,000 during these 9 years, the percentage of the per capita income of our farm population for these years of 1933 to 1941, inclusive, has remained at exactly the same low figure of 21.2 percent as it was in the previous period of 1910 to 1932, inclusive. And on top of this deplorable low income for farmers, during the last 20 years, the farmers of America have lost more than one-half of their capital, or equity, in their farms and equipment. Their equity has decreased during the last 20 years from \$68,000,000,000 to \$33,000,000,000.

Our American farmers and ranchers are in a most deplorable financial condition, and right at the time when we need them most they are more impoverished than ever before in the history of our Nation. Texas is the largest agricultural State in the Nation, yet in the last 10 years 95,978 tenant farmers have left the farms to take up other lines of work where they could make a living, and that is about one-third of the tenant farmers we had in Texas in 1930. The exact number of tenant farmers in Texas in 1930, according to the census statistics, was 292,063, and in 1940 it was 196,085. Tenant farmers are farmers who actually till the soil but do not own the farms. The owners of the farms, deserted by the tenants, must either hire farm labor to operate them or let them lay out of production. In order to hire farm labor, the farm owner must pay wages in competition with factory wages, because there is now a shortage of labor, and factory wages have advanced from 20 cents per hour in 1910 to 73.6 cents per hour in 1941. It is this shortage of labor and increased industrial wages that have changed our whole farm problem, and this grave and dangerous farm problem is staring us in the face right now. We have another class of farms. It is the farmer-owned and farmer-operated farms. These farms are generally operated by the whole family. Most of the young men on these farms have gone into the armed forces of our Nation, and many of the young women have gone into the airplane factories and other factories and offices to help carry on the war effort. This leaves only the old folks at home on their farms. They are unable to operate the farms alone and must pay competitive wages to get help. Factory wages are high, and farming is unprofitable; hence thousands of our good farmers are selling their dairy herds for slaughtering purposes, and, for the same reasons, poultry raisers are selling off their flocks. This situation at present is indeed dangerous and alarming. Our citizens who are left on the farms are the salt of the earth—they are truly patriotic. They are not threatening to strike—that thought has not entered their minds. They want to produce to the limit of their ability. But, regardless of their patriotism and their desire to keep up farm

production, they simply cannot plow and sow and reap unless they can hire farm labor; and if they hire farm labor, they must pay current labor wages; and if they hire labor, they must get a price for their farm products that will include the cost of all labor. One-hundred-percent-parity prices does not include farm labor. The Thomas-Hatch amendment directs that farm labor be included. The House of Representatives has passed the measure, including the same amendment, by an overwhelming vote of 284 to 96. It is predicted that the Senate will defeat the Thomas-Hatch amendment tomorrow. In my opinion, the defeat of that amendment will be a severe blow to agriculture, and, as I said before, it may mean a shortage of food. It seems to me that we are having enough shortages of essential materials and products in this country at this time. I feel sure that most Senators appreciate hearing from their constituents back home on important matters like this, and I trust that all of you folks will give the problem your serious consideration; and, if you think advisable, wire your Senators today your views on the subject.

This is Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas, speaking from Washington and wishing you all a most pleasant good afternoon.

BRYAN, TEX., September 28, 1942.

SENATOR W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:

Members of this association numbering over 8,000 are looking to our Senators for help and protection in this time of dire need. We do not advise you as to your position on this bill, but we feel that you will act wisely in protecting the interest of the cotton farmer.

TOM FIELD,

Barzoo Valley Cotton Growers' Association.

HENDERSON, TEX., September 28, 1942.

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Suggest you support Thomas amendment to price stabilization bill.

RUSK COUNTY FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
C. L. CRIM, President.
BURRIS E. DORSEY, Secretary.

ODEM, TEX., September 28, 1942.

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Stand pat or go hungry.

E. C. CALDWELL.

MOSCOW, IDAHO, September 27, 1942.

SENATOR W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of the News Review Publishing Co. which publishes the largest circulating afternoon newspaper in North Idaho, may I thank you for your speech. The farmers of this locality are seeing their crops lying on the ground, unable to harvest them for lack of help, while at Bayview, a few miles away, the Government is paying \$11 a day for laborers grubbing stumps, \$15 a day for dishwashers, and \$20 a day for carpenters, and so on. It is this exorbitant wage scale that is causing what inflation there may be, and if it is not controlled, Americans are very apt to go hungry in 1943. The farmers of this county are getting a bit tired of the fantastic political moves of the New Deal, and will welcome a change. May I suggest that you show this wire or make copies of it and give one to every Senator in Washington. A return to the simple fundamentals of the Constitution is the only thing that will save our beloved America in this hour of its greatest crisis. The farmers of North Idaho are behind you.

DR. FRANK B. ROBINSON.

PADUCAH, TEX., September 28, 1942.

SENATOR W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Cottley County Farm Bureau thinks labor cost should be included in arriving at parity for farm prices.

G. A. MATES, President.
HOMER NICHOLS, Secretary.

NEW YORK, N. Y., September 27, 1942.

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

Commending you on your speech on the farm prices.

RAYFORD.

HASKELL, TEX., September 28, 1942.

HON. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We sincerely ask you to fight for 100 parity, including labor cost to farmers.

WEINERT FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
FRANK OMAN, Chairman, Weinert, Tex.

GEORGETOWN, TEX., September 28, 1942.

HON. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.:

Am mailing you tomorrow a petition with 145 signatures protesting the reduction of ceiling prices on farm products below 110 percent of parity.

R. A. JAEGER, Jarrell, Tex.

PLANO, TEX., September 28, 1942.

SENATOR W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Farmers of this community urge you to fight for Thomas-Hatch amendment to Price Control Act. Farm labor costs have risen 100 percent. This must be taken into parity formula if we are to have maximum production in 1943.

PLANO FARM BUREAU,
JOHN D. WELLS.

WAXAHATCHIE, TEX., September 26, 1942.

SENATOR W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

The farmers of Texas will make as great a sacrifice toward winning the war as any group, but with limited finance, and when the price of products will not pay living costs and rising labor costs, how can they continue to produce? We only ask for an equal opportunity.

ELLIS COUNTY AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
C. H. FIGG, President.

ORANGE, TEX., September 26, 1942.

SENATOR W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to support the Hatch-Thomas amendment to price-control bill, which would include cost of farm labor in parity formula.

AMERICAN RICE GROWERS
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.

ORANGE, TEX., September 26, 1942.

SENATOR W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to support the Hatch-Thomas amendment to price-control bill, which would include cost of farm labor in parity formula.

JOE HARMON.

ORANGE, TEX., September 26, 1942.

SENATOR W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to support the Hatch-Thomas amendment to price-control bill, which would include cost of farm labor in parity formula.

ELROY CROOK.

CORSICANA, TEX., September 26, 1942.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

The past 10 years Congress has given the President every piece damnable destructive legislation requested to create laziness, thriftlessness, indifference to our American way of life. Now, when feeble attempt at legislation is made, Congress twiddles thumbs, saying to whom are you demanding, while our boys die and prices soar.

E. W. HABLE.

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., September 27, 1942.
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Utmost importance to consider labor in deriving parity for farm commodities. Food shortage certain if labor not maintained on farm. Farm operators selling daily, due to shortage of labor in this district.

LOYD D. BARBOUR,
Director, Texas Farm Bureau
Federation, Iowa Park, Tex.

JAYTON, TEX., September 26, 1942.
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Vote for 100-percent parity plus cost.
W. C. LONG,
Girard, Tex.

ASPERMONT, TEX., September 26, 1942.
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Respectfully urge you support 100-percent parity plus cost of labor for farm prices. Labor costs have soared from 100 to 200 percent in past 12 months, caused partly from administration's attitude on union labor situation. Farmer will have to meet competition on labor in order to produce food requirements.

ROY G. ANDERSON, County Judge.
R. L. SPRINGER, Mayor.

ASPERMONT, TEX., September 26, 1942.
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Stonewall County Farm Bureau urges your support of full parity prices to agriculture including farm labor in arriving at parity. This is necessary to maintain adequate agricultural production.

STONEWALL COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
T. E. HART, President,
EVIN G. HOLSTON, Vice President,
E. G. ALLWAY, Secretary.

SPUR, TEX., September 26, 1942.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Would like to include labor in bill coming up in next few days. Farmers in this area are behind you.
TEXAS FARM BUREAU OF KENT COUNTY,
L. R. REID, Member.

JAYTON, TEX., September 26, 1942.
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Vote for 100-percent parity plus cost.
JOE HUNNICUTT,
Girard, Tex.

JAYTON, TEX., September 26, 1942.
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Vote for 100-percent parity plus cost.
S. E. SHERES,
Girard, Tex.

JAYTON, TEX., September 26, 1942.
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Vote for 100-percent parity plus cost.
GEORGE SPRADLING,
Girard, Tex.

JAYTON, TEX., September 26, 1942.
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Vote for 100-percent parity plus cost.
A. G. DYER,
Girard, Tex.

JAYTON, TEX., September 26, 1942.
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Vote for 100-percent parity plus cost.
G. L. HAMILTON,
Girard, Tex.

ORANGE, TEX., September 26, 1942.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to support the Hatch-Thomas amendment to price-control bill which would include cost of farm labor in priority formula.
ED SHANNON.

ORANGE, TEX., September 26, 1942.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to support the Hatch-Thomas amendment to price-control bill which would include cost of farm labor in priority formula.
A. W. PEVETO.

ORANGE, TEX., September 26, 1942.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to support the Hatch-Thomas amendment to price-control bill which would include cost of farm labor in priority formula.
LAWRENCE BROUSSARD.

JAYTON, TEX., September 26, 1942.
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Vote for 100-percent parity plus cost.
C. M. STINNETT,
Girard, Tex.

ITHACA, N. Y., September 28, 1942.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Have just listened to your broadcast on price-control bill and need of including cost of farm labor in parity formula. You are absolutely correct. Based on cost of living, New York factory workers now have a parity of 195 percent compared to farm parity of 100, which does not include cost of farm labor. New York farm prices now 50 percent above 1910 to 1914, but farm wages are over 100 percent higher and weekly earnings of factory workers 217 percent higher than base period. Food production will decline, for farmers cannot compete with cost-plus industry in employing labor. Our organization, representing more than 100,000 New York State farmers, strongly urges you continue fight for inclusion farm wages in parity formula.

NEW YORK STATE CONFERENCE
BOARD OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS,
E. S. FOSTER, Secretary.

DUMAS, TEX., September 26, 1942.
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL:
We urge you to support and use your influence to secure passage of bill that includes

farm-labor cost and the parity formula, that definite ceilings be provided on wages at a comparable level with ceiling on farm prices.
MOORE COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
H. E. HELTON, Secretary.

SPUR, TEX., September 25, 1942.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

This is to remind you that a majority of farmers in this area endorse the policy of our farm leaders in Washington, and do not believe that their demands are against the best interests of the country as a whole.

DICKENS COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
BOB HAHN, President.

DALLAS, TEX., September 25, 1942.
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Re Joint Resolution 161: We believe rate control for motor carriers should be assigned to Interstate Commerce Commission. We favor freezing of wages if farm prices are frozen at parity without consideration of labor costs. Farm-labor manpower critical, with 100-percent increase in cost over last year. We respectfully request your earnest consideration of these matters.

GILLETTE MOTOR TRANSPORT, INC.,
FRED GILLETTE, President.

THREE RIVERS, TEX., September 25, 1942.
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Stay in the fight. All we want is justice. Make them figure what real parity is with today's industrial prices would mean in food costs. The way to block inflation is to bring labor cost down to parity with farm earnings.

Mr. and Mrs. B. C. Claunch and Messrs. Koonce K. Matula, E. Matula, R. Matula, Edge Chandler, L. Claunch, Dun Stalcup, P. Wheeler, T. Wheeler, H. Mills, Reagan O. Woodward, G. Woodward, H. Richter, B. Richter, C. White, M. White, F. Machart, F. Mills, Foster, Verana, J. Mills, Stuart Schwartz, D. Calliham, H. Calliham, Mmes. Chandler Claunch, Dunn Stalcup, Wheeler, Mills.

DALLAS, TEX., September 25, 1942.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Please make every effort to save our farms. Within the last 5 days we have had 1,000 acres of black-land farms released, and we have no prospects for 1943 tenants. They are leaving the farms for more compensation. It seems to us who are primarily interested in producing food for the armies and the people of this country that this job is up to the Senate and Congress, who should in some way provide a sufficient income to the farmers so they would be able to employ sufficient help at living wage to carry on this industry. This condition is not us alone but with hundreds of other landowners. We own and operate over 50 farms.

G. D. GAY & SON.

ARLINGTON, TEX., September 25, 1942.
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We suggest you give consideration to the possibility of the entire country facing an acute shortage of farm commodities unless some provision is made to place farmers in position to secure farm labor at rates in proper ratio to prices of farm products. We estimate that there is a probability of 45 percent of the farms in our trade territory being idle under present conditions.

ARLINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
R. H. HOUSTON, Secretary.

FLOYDADA, TEX., September 25, 1942.

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

We are in favor of the amendment including farm labor in arriving at parity for farm commodities.

FARMERS GR. CO.

AUSTIN, TEX., September 26, 1942.

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Although we are paying farm labor in central Texas two and a half times as much as last year, labor and renters are quitting farming. It is imperative that increasing labor costs be considered in price ceilings to enable farmers to continue producing. Hope you will aid fight.

J. TALBOT LAPRELLE.

FORT WORTH, TEX., September 15, 1942.

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:

Hope you will not consider for 1 minute any legislation that contemplates a ceiling on either farm products or manufactured articles that does not carry a correspondingly rigid control over the wages which determine the cost of such commodities. It may seem silly for me to ask you to do a thing that is so obviously necessary but it seems that there are those in Washington who advocate something different and we hope your voice will be heard. Any other course is certainly going to bankrupt this country.

J. E. FENDER,

President, Acme Brick Co.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the broad objectives of national need must not be obscured in order to justify the acceptance of any one single formula of price control, irrespective of what it may be. One objective we must ever keep in mind is the absolute necessity of producing vast supplies of food for war purposes. Food is as necessary for victory as are planes, and if we are to have adequate food supplies, we must protect the producers—those whose lives and labors make possible the corn, the cotton, the wheat, the livestock, and the dairy products which we now require in large quantities.

I believe that the pressure of idle money on short supplies in the food market will make for inflation. I believe that inflation is a robber that takes from both the producer and the consumer. I believe that plentiful production is our surest defense against inflation. It must be obvious that we shall not lack for production because of any inherent shortage in our agricultural goods. Production costs and prices largely determine the amount of production.

There seems to be no shortage of cash with which to buy agricultural products. A volume production based on volume mass purchasing should in itself tend to hold down prices of many agricultural commodities within the reach of the average pocketbook. It will not work that way in all cases, and therefore fixed ceiling prices will continue to be necessary.

Mr. President, if prices operate in such a way as to impose their burden chiefly on the producers, there is certain to be a curtailment of production, and that is the very thing we do not want. We

should work toward methods of operation and prices which will increase production, and make what is produced available as never before in the interest of higher standards of national nutrition, and for supplies needed at the front by our boys. There is no reason to believe that American farmers will be governed in their production by theories, fanciful or otherwise, which may be urged in Congress. Farmers will be governed by the hard economic facts which face them day by day. At the present time those facts have not called forth the maximum production of which our farm population is capable, and in our discussion of the measure now before us we must face the same facts.

What are these facts? Among them are a few that are particularly important at the present time. Farm labor is scarce. Wages for farm labor constitute a large part of what farmers must include in their index of production costs. Old formulas of farm prices based on conditions existing at the beginning of this century will not meet the present need. All the factors which make for the present problems of production must be considered in the way they now affect agricultural production.

Mr. President, I do not pose as a farm expert. Nevertheless, I have a well-defined interest in agricultural production. I believe I recognize its significance in the present emergency, and it seems better to me that we have national unity and full production than an unnecessary spirit of grievance and a lag in production. All of us are in this war and all of us must pay for its costs.

Mr. President, during almost a quarter of a century I have had much to do with the operation of a 1,200-acre farm. It has one of the finest dairy herds in that section of the country. It has also one of the largest general and vegetable gardens in that territory. I know what it means to have top farm prices and low farm prices.

I am convinced that no action which we may take that induces or encourages the spiral of inflation will bring any lasting benefit to the farmers or to the Nation. Therefore, I am prepared to vote against the pending amendment, and shall favor the substitute proposal, hoping in this way to record my desire to avoid the dangers of inflation, to encourage fair farm prices and, particularly, to encourage national unity.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Ball	Bilbo
Andrews	Bankhead	Bone
Austin	Barbour	Brewster
Bailey	Barkley	Bridges

Brooks	Hill	Reed
Brown	Holman	Reynolds
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Rosier
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Kilgore	Schwartz
Byrd	La Follette	Shipstead
Capper	Langer	Smathers
Caraway	Lee	Smith
Chandler	Lodge	Spencer
Ghavez	Lucas	Stewart
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Taft
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Danaher	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Davis	Maloney	Tobey
Downey	Maybank	Tunnell
Doxey	Mead	Tydings
Ellender	Millikin	Vandenberg
George	Murdock	Van Nuys
Gerry	Murray	Wagner
Gillette	Norris	Wallgren
Green	Nye	Walsh
Guffey	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Gurney	O'Mahoney	White
Hatch	Overton	Wiley
Hayden	Pepper	Willis
Herring	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I dislike to impose a speech on the Senate at this time, especially after the joint resolution has been pending in the Senate and been debated here for over a week. Much has been said on the subject, and probably what will be added by me will be somewhat cumulative. But I wonder why it is necessary for us to consider the pending legislation in the light of the President's message to Congress of September 7, 1942, in which he said, in part:

Therefore, I ask the Congress to pass legislation under which the President would be specifically authorized to stabilize the cost of living, including the price of all farm commodities. The purpose should be to hold farm prices at parity, or at levels of a recent date, whichever is higher.

I ask the Congress to take this action by the 1st of October. Inaction on your part by that date will leave me with an inescapable responsibility to the people of this country to see to it that the war effort is no longer imperiled by threat of economic chaos. In the event that the Congress should fail to act, and act adequately, I shall accept the responsibility, and I will act.

That challenge to Congress, Mr. President, should not take away the right of any Senator to express his views; not in opposition to the President, or with an idea of causing disunity, but because of a solemn right granted under our Constitution to any Member of this body to follow such a course as in his wisdom is deemed best to meet the situation confronting us. If the President has the power to act, let him assume the responsibility and go full speed ahead. On the other hand if he is not sufficiently clothed with such power and he seeks it from Congress then let us proceed in the regular way and try to make democracy work.

In his message of September 7, the President said in part:

After all, parity is, by its very definition, a fair relationship between the prices of the things farmers sell and the things they buy. Calculations of parity must include all costs of production, including the cost of labor.

I challenge any Senator to show where in the Thomas amendment does not

carry out this directive. All that the proponents of this measure are asking is that in figuring out parity that all labor costs shall be included—not may, but shall be included—in the formula.

Mr. President, many Senators are of the opinion that we should not disturb the parity formula during the war. They feel we should be content with the mere addition of the cost of all labor to other costs before a maximum price is established on any agricultural commodity. I am in agreement with that proposition, if the original Thomas-Hatch amendment is defeated. I have prepared two amendments that I propose to offer should the Thomas-Hatch amendment fail. The main purpose of my amendments is not to disturb the parity formula.

The first amendment would incorporate all the language which is now in the joint resolution beginning on page 4—that is, the so-called O'Mahoney amendment—down to the comma in line 9, after the word "purposes", strike out the comma, insert a period, and add the following language:

In determining maximum prices for agricultural commodities all farm labor, among other costs, shall be included as an integral part of the production cost of such commodity and shall be taken into consideration in determining such maximum prices.

In my humble judgment that language is on all fours with the very language which the President uttered in his message to Congress of September 7 and which I had occasion to quote a few minutes ago.

If that amendment should fail, since there are some Senators who believe that the cost of the farmer's own labor and that of his wife and children should not be included in fixing maximum prices, I shall propose an amendment to this effect: Take the O'Mahoney amendment as written, and in line 9 on page 4, after the word "purposes", strike out the comma, insert a period, and add this language:

In determining maximum prices for agricultural commodities all hired farm labor, among other costs, shall be included as an integral part of the production cost of such commodities and shall be taken into consideration in determining such maximum prices.

My reason in supporting the Thomas-Hatch amendment, and should that fail, to then propose the above amendment is to have a positive directive to include labor, because I feel confident that if we do not follow that course the farmers of our Nation will not be able to produce at a profit. They have been patient, but they feel that unless it is made obligatory on the part of the administrator of the law to include labor as costs of production, that it will not be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me call the Senator's attention to this aspect of the matter, which it seems to me has been either misunderstood or wholly misrepresented: Under the pending amendment the

farmer would not necessarily get the price which is intended. It is not a guaranty that the farmer would receive such a price. Unless by the natural laws of economics his price should rise to the maximum, he would not necessarily get it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Ought we to fix a prohibition, and say that he shall not receive less than what it actually costs him to produce the commodity? If we are to fix a ceiling or limitation beyond which he may not go, ought not that to be high enough to reimburse him for the increased amount which he must pay out for labor, over and above what he formerly had to pay?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I desire to say to the Senator in order to meet the last suggestion made by him one of the amendments proposed by me would take care of the situation. As a last resort, I would be partly satisfied if only the increased cost of labor to produce the commodities were added as cost, before fixing maximum prices.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is one other aspect of the question which it seems to me ought to be noticed, and that is that we all admit that increased costs in other industries, resulting from higher wages and other industrial costs, should be recognized. We admit that industry is entitled to a higher return in wartime than in peacetime. Why? Because of the war. Does it not follow inexorably that if the farmer's costs have been increased by the war condition, he should have the same consideration as other industries receive?

Mr. ELLENDER. There should be no argument on that proposition. I had expected to touch upon that aspect of the problem during the course of my speech. Since the question is raised at the moment, however, let me point out to the Senator from Texas these figures: In 1910 factory wages per employed worker were at the level of 99.6. Last July, 2 months ago, they were at the level of 327, an increase of almost three and one-half times to what they were during the so-called comparable times of 1909-14; but not much has been said about that phase of the problem. I intend to cover that point in detail, to show the vast difference between the incomes of factory workers and other nonfarm labor, in contrast to what farm income actually is today.

I read some of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee. We can paint a beautiful picture of contrasts if we use only a set of figures which work against the farmer. For example, I recall the speech made last week by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] wherein he took the farm income of 1939, which was at the lowest level since 1932, and compared the rapid rise in farm prices from that time to the present and contrasted those figures with

the rise of nonfarm income, which, by the way, was already at a fairly high level. He used that comparison to show the great increase in income which the farmers of the Nation have been receiving because of the war. However, if we make a comparison between 1910 and 1942, we see that the farmer's increase in income today is far below that received by nonfarm labor, and below nonfarm income. I propose to submit that in more detail in the course of my remarks. I have many authentic tables to present which will give the picture as it really is and no further arguments will be necessary to convince the most skeptical.

Mr. CONNALLY. When the Senator reaches that point in his address, will he compare the percentage of increase in farm prices with the increased wages received by industrial labor, and particularly war-plant labor, since the war started?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have some figures which to my way of thinking ought to astound the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot offer any hope on that basis. I have already been astounded so many times that I cannot stand any more. [Laughter.]

Mr. ELLENDER. Then I shall present the facts to the Nation, and call the Nation's attention to the large discrepancy which exists between farm and nonfarm groups, and how wages have increased in nonfarming activities, as contrasted with what the farming group receives.

Mr. President, no one within the hearing of my voice will question the fact that our great President has done more for agriculture than has any other man who ever occupied the White House. Nobody doubts that. He proposed many measures which are now law. What I am about to say is not in criticism of the President, but I voice my convictions in order to show what the so-called unprincipled, ruthless, reckless farm bloc has done to balance the scales. I contend that if it had not been for the work of this belittled farm bloc that the farmers might be hopelessly further from parity than they now are.

It was all well and good to put the parity concept in the Farm Act of 1937 and later revise it so as to improve the formula. Such revision did some good but the farmer was far short of parity. Everybody remembers that when the prices of farm commodities began to rise in 1937 the administration, acting through Mr. Eccles and some of the administrators in the Department of Agriculture, said, in effect, "Prices are too high, they must come down." As a result of such action the returns received by the farmer dropped from a high of 121 in 1937 to a low of 93 in 1939, all of which can be seen by reference to a chart that I propose to incorporate in the Record in the course of my speech.

Who was responsible for raising the parity payments to the farmers? The President? No. It was the farm bloc. In 1938, when we proposed an increase in farm prices, the President said, "Unless

you find the money I will veto the item." In effect that is what he stated. That can be found in his state papers, volume 8, page 378:

The Price Adjustment Act of June 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 809, 819), appropriated \$212,000,000 for these parity payments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, but no revenue had been provided by the Congress for these payments. During the debates in 1938 it was indicated that after January 1, 1939, the question of additional revenue would be taken up, at a time when the Congress would have better information on which to proceed.

On January 3, 1939, I sent to the Congress my Budget message for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940 (see item 3, this volume). In that message I pointed out that the Congress had adopted this program for "parity" payments to farmers, but had so far provided no sources of revenue for these payments.

While the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the next fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, was under consideration, the Secretary of Agriculture reminded the committee that they had not yet provided the funds for the \$212,000,000 of parity payments which had been appropriated by the Congress for the year previous, and that, therefore, the bill for the next year did not contain any provision for an appropriation for parity payments.

What tactics did the farm bloc have to resort to in order to make it possible to appropriate \$212,000,000 to be utilized toward paying parity? We had to add a title—title V, as I recall—to the W. P. A. appropriation bill and incorporate in it the \$212,000,000. It was felt that the President would not veto the appropriation bill, since it was necessary to have money to take care of the W. P. A. workers.

Let me say in passing that, although I may be wrong about it, I do not know of any appropriation ever proposed before the Senate in which the executive department has tried to get the Congress to first obtain funds before the appropriation was made.

I say to the Members of the Senate that we have almost had to corkscrew out of the administration some of the gains made by the farmers on parity and other items. Senators will recall what happened last year when we attempted to raise parity payments by appropriating more funds. We had in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill an item for four-hundred-and-seventy-odd-million dollars, as I recall, for that purpose. That was to bring up parity prices to almost 100 percent. What happened to it? The bill was before Congress for quite some time. The Department of Agriculture and the President were opposed to the larger appropriation. In the meantime the Congress passed a bill making it possible for farmers to borrow as much as 85 percent of parity on some of their commodities. I am informed that the Chief Executive agreed to sign the bill calling for 85 percent of parity loans, provided that the appropriation for parity was reduced from four-hundred-and-seventy-odd-million dollars to \$212,000,000. That of course was acceptable because all that the farm bloc desired was to assure parity prices to the farmer. I cite this instance

merely to show that the farm bloc has had to fight and fight always to obtain a few crumbs for the farmers.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Brown] cited another incident enacted in aid of the farmer. He gave credit to the executive branch for what was done in their behalf. Let me give the history of that proposal—not in an attempt to criticize the President, but in order to show that it was the farm bloc in the Senate and the farm bloc in the House which actually paved the way for the reduced interest rates which the distinguished Senator from Michigan credited in his address last week to the account of the executive department.

I am sure that all Senators will remember the history of the legislation. It will be recalled that in the Seventy-fifth Congress, of January 1937, both the House of Representatives and the Senate passed the bill to reduce the interest rates paid by farmers to Federal agencies. What happened to the bill? As the senior Senator from South Carolina will recall, both Houses of Congress passed it by overwhelming majorities. It went to the White House and was vetoed.

I do not know why the President vetoed it. He acted within his rights, but it remained to the Senate and the House to override the President's veto so as to give to the farmers the reduced interest rates which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Brown] implied was granted by Executive approval.

The next year a measure was introduced in the House of Representatives for the purpose of extending the provisions of the bill which was enacted during the Seventy-fifth Congress. Again the measure passed this body and passed the House of Representatives by tremendous majorities. It went to the White House and was vetoed. It came back to Congress, and again we passed it by overwhelming majorities. The last time that such proposed legislation was placed before this body, for further enactment, was during the Seventy-sixth Congress. Both Houses passed the bill, and the President signed it.

Mr. President, again I say, I am not citing these cases in criticism of the President, but I am calling attention to them simply to show that unless the so-called farm bloc had responded or come to the aid of the farmers of the Nation the farmers would be in a worse state than they now are. We have been their guardians and protectors and I for one will dedicate much of my time in order to further help them.

Mr. President, as I stated a while ago, the language which we are trying to incorporate into the pending measure is simply language to make it mandatory that in fixing parity prices all farm labor shall be included. I shall point out to the Senate what items constitute the farmers' income, when it is said that they received 15 percent for one year, 10 percent for another year and so on of the national income. Such farmers' income is not net income or anything like it, but it takes into consideration and

includes everything the farmers grow on their farms for their own requirements. It includes all cattle, hogs, chickens, and everything else that they raise for their own maintenance. It includes the rental value of farm dwellings, also hired labor, and the increase in the value of farm property.

I shall show in just a few minutes that the amount of actual cash which finds its way into the pockets of the farmers of this Nation is less than the gross income of four or five of the large corporations of our country. Imagine, Senators, that in some years over one-third of the people of the Nation—the farmers, who produce the commodities necessary to feed and clothe us, to feed and clothe our armed forces, and to feed and clothe those who produce for the armed forces—have received in actual cash less than 3 percent of the total income of the Nation.

I shall place these figures in the RECORD. I do not want to burden the Members of the Senate with further explanation, but in all sincerity and in all seriousness I ask that Senators consider and study them. If they do so, it may be that the Members of the Senate will see the pending amendment in its true light and will vote to help the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFarland in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. A few minutes ago the Senator from Louisiana referred to a statement contained in the President's speech or in his message to Congress. I am not aware which one the quotation was taken from.

Mr. ELLENDER. The President's message to Congress of September 7.

Mr. BONE. On that date the President sent a message to Congress and also delivered a radio address. Let me ask the Senator in which of the two documents we shall find the quotation employed by the Senator. I am sorry to trouble the Senator about the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is quite all right; I am glad to be able to oblige the Senator. The document from which I quoted is Document No. 834, a message from the President of the United States to the Congress. The quotation appears on page 5, near the bottom of the page.

Let me say to the Senator from Washington that what I am saying today should not be interpreted as a criticism of the President or of the position of any Senator. If the President desires to put a proposition before the Senate, I believe that he should expect us to express our views regarding it. In this light, whatever I say is not a criticism of his judgment, nor by any means is it a criticism of the war effort.

Mr. President, what I fear is that if we do not in some way take care of the increased cost of labor to the farmers of our Nation there will be reduced production. That is what will happen. I am

experienced in the farming business, and I can speak with authority. I am convinced that farmers cannot remain in business unless added costs of labor are given consideration in fixing maximum prices.

Mr. President, it is not that we do not have faith in the President's judgment. I bow to no Senator on this floor when it comes to having supported the President since I have been a Member of the Senate. I have worked loyally with him, and I expect to continue cooperating with him in our war effort. We owe it to the Nation; we owe it to the President, as our great leader.

I sincerely believe that the President has been misadvised as to this problem; and, so far as I am concerned, I do not have much faith in the judgment of some of his advisers, especially some of those who have to do with the farm problem and the Office of the Price Administrator. I may put it in this way—that I have lost faith in some of the advisers to the advisers of the President. Some of the advisers to the advisers of the President do not know any more about the problem that is confronting them and is in their hands for consideration than a rooster knows when Sunday comes around. [Laughter.]

In order to prove the idea, let me say that 2 or 3 months ago an effort was made by someone in the Office of Price Administrator to place a ceiling on fur coats. What month do you think was selected as a basis for the ceiling? The month of March, when the price of fur coats is usually from 30 to 40 percent less than their retail price in the winter-time. Who would have suffered if such an order had been issued? Not the manufacturer, not the retailer, but the poor trapper in my State and the trappers from every other State who furnish fur, who break the ice every winter morning to trap the animals which supply the fur from which the coats are made. They would be the sufferers.

Mr. President, who do you think was the administrator of the regulations with respect to fur coats? He was a little shavetail who, by the way, I may say to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], was from North Carolina. He had been a tobacco grader, I understand, and did not know much about fur. I took the matter up with him and discussed it, and after 2 or 3 weeks the order was finally written to follow the formula which I suggested. The manufacturers of furs usually buy their fur in July and August, and depending upon what they have to pay for the raw fur in July and August determines the price of the coat sold to the retailer and the price the retailer quotes to the ultimate consumer. In other words, what the order finally did, in accordance with the suggestion made by me was to fix the cost to the manufacturer at the time he purchased the fur and made the coats and the cost to the retailer at the time he normally sells coats. So I think the ceiling for fur coats has been so fixed that the man who ensnares or traps the animal will get a fair percentage.

Mr. President, everyone knows that when we discussed the price-control bill in the Senate last January there were four formulas written into the bill providing for methods by which farm prices were to be measured, and whichever was the highest the farmer would receive. Nobody doubted that; nobody took issue with it except myself, only, however, by way of emphasis. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], who handled the price-control bill, placed in the RECORD, at pages 718-719, a table indicating the price floors for selected agricultural commodities under the House price-control bill. The table was placed in the RECORD so that every Senator could look at it and ascertain how certain commodities would be affected by the price-control bill. On one item, sugarcane for sugar, per ton, the highest price reached was the average price between July 1919 and June 1929, of \$5.93. For sugar beets the highest per-ton price was not the average price between July 1919 and June 1929, but the 110-parity formula, which gave the beet producers \$8.71 for their commodity.

When the debate was about to be concluded, I interrogated the Senator from Michigan on that point in order to make it plain and clear so that there would not be any ifs and ands about the matter. This is the colloquy that ensued as found on page 718 of the RECORD:

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. As I understand the bill as agreed to in conference, the possible price ceilings of farm commodities are determined by one of four methods, whichever is the higher, to wit: First, 110 percent of parity; second, the estimated October 1, 1941, farm price; third, the average price from 1919 to 1929; and, fourth, the December 15, 1941, farm price. Am I correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then, I proceeded to ask further questions, which I shall not read but which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, at this point. They show that the Senator from Michigan while handling the price-control bill interpreted the measure in accordance with the formula to which I have just referred and the table on page 695, to which I have adverted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to by the Senator from Louisiana will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has placed in the RECORD in connection with his remarks a table which deals with the parity price of sugar beets and sugarcane per ton. I notice that according to this table the average price for sugar beets and sugarcane from 1909-14 was \$5.50 and \$3.73, respectively, and that 110 percent of parity, as of December 15, 1941, would make the price for sugar beets at \$8.71 and \$5.91 for sugarcane, per ton. The 10-year average price for sugar beets is \$8.34 per ton, and for sugarcane, \$5.93.

Now, at the bottom of the table appears this notation:

"The anticipated 1942 crop returns to growers will be as follows: For sugar beets, \$8.65 per ton, and sugarcane, \$5.25."

How does the Senator reconcile those figures with the ones I have just indicated? In other words, the highest price for sugarcane is to be found in the 10-year average method, which is \$5.93 per ton, and for sugar beets the highest price is found, according to the 110 percent of parity formula, which is \$8.71 per ton, whereas the notation to which I have referred would make it \$8.65 for sugar beets and \$5.35 for sugarcane.

Mr. BROWN. I am unable fully to comprehend that rather fine-spun distinction, and I should not want to change the general statement I made at the time I discussed the bill. Generally speaking, I understand that the proposed law is very clear, that whichever minimum for any agricultural product is the highest, whichever ceiling is the highest, is the one which will be chosen.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, if the 10-year average price of sugarcane is the greater, then that will be the ceiling for that commodity, and likewise, if the 110-percent parity price for sugar beets is the greater, that will be the price ceiling for that commodity.

Mr. BROWN. That is my assumption.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator and I feel certain that is the understanding of every Senator here present. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks a letter addressed to me by F. L. Thomsen, acting head of the Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Department of Agriculture, dated January 23, 1942, together with an attached table.

There being no objection, the letter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 23, 1942.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This will confirm the prices given you over the telephone today by Mr. Randall:

Cottonseed: Crude, f. o. b. southeastern mills: October 1, 12.62 cents per pound; December 12, 12.50 cents per pound; January 22, 12.62 cents per pound.

Cotton: Parity December 15 on the basis of United States average price received by farmers for all types and grades of cotton sold, 17.83 cents per pound.

Cotton: Average price of fifteen-sixteenths inch Middling at the 10 spot markets, October 1, 17.11 cents per pound; December 15, 17.19 cents per pound; January 22, 19.43 cents per pound.

Rice, rough: Parity December 15 on the basis of United States average price received by farmers, \$1.171 per bushel, which is the equivalent of \$4.21 for a barrel of 162 pounds.

Rice: Fancy Blue Rose at New Orleans: September 29, \$4.15 per hundred pounds; December 15, \$6.15 per hundred pounds; January 19, \$6.65 per hundred pounds.

I am also enclosing the table I mentioned. You will note that the October 1 and December 15 prices in the table are farm prices. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the conference report specifies market prices on October 1 and December 15. Since there are such a large number of market prices for the various commodities, we have included the farm price on the assumption that if ceilings were placed on the market prices at the levels of October 1 or December 15, prices to farmers would be equal to those indicated in the table, providing there was no change in the margin between the farm prices and the market prices for the various grades and markets.

Yours very truly,

F. L. THOMSEN,
Acting Head, Division of Statistical
and Historical Research.

Possible price ceilings

Commodity	Unit	110 percent of Dec. 15, 1941, parity price	Estimated Oct. 1, 1941, farm price ¹	Average farm price, 1919-29 ²	Dec. 15, 1941, farm price
Cotton	Pound	Dollars 0.1965	Dollars 0.1704	Dollars 0.2147	Dollars 0.1623
Cottonseed	Ton	35.72	50.36	37.20	44.65
Wheat	Bushel	1.400	.934	1.325	1.022
Corn	Bushel	1.016	.678	.889	.669
Oats	Bushel	.632	.394	.474	.452
Barley	Bushel	.980	.504	.693	.561
Rye	Bushel	1.141	.543	.947	.578
Rice (rough)	Bushel	1.288	.929	1.270	1.439
Flaxseed	Bushel	2.07	1.74	2.34	1.78
Beans, dry edible	Hundredweight	5.34	4.31	5.77	4.93
Potatoes	Bushel	1.114	0.658	1.245	0.827
Sweetpotatoes	Bushel	1.390	.902	1.344	.866
Hay, all	Ton	18.80	8.14	13.53	9.43
Peanuts	Pound	.0759	.0440	.0580	.0473
Apples	Bushel	1.52	.86	1.46	1.09
Hogs	Hundredweight	11.44	10.59	9.77	10.21
Beef cattle	Hundredweight	8.25	9.27	7.18	9.38
Veal calves	Hundredweight	10.69	11.20	9.65	11.22
Lambs	Hundredweight	9.30	9.75	11.12	9.86
Butter	Pound	.404	.330	.428	.339
Butterfat	Pound	3.455	.370	.440	.360
Milk, wholesale	Hundredweight	42.53	2.48	42.53	2.66
Milk, retail	Quart	.108	.111	.113	.114
Chickens, live	Pound	.180	.162	.211	.158
Turkeys, live	Pound	.228	.182	.288	.209
Eggs	Dozen	1.422	.310	.332	.341
Wool	Pound	.290	.363	.341	.371

¹ A average of prices received by farmers on Sept. 15 and Oct. 15.² A average of monthly prices received by farmers, July 1919 to June 1929.³ Adjusted for seasonal variation.⁴ 110 percent of parity and average farm price 1919-29 are equal.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, what did the administrators of the law do? Did they follow the law as it was written by the Congress? I should say not. They allowed the beet-sugar producers—and I am not complaining about that—a price equal to 110 percent of parity, but, when it came to the sugarcane producers, instead of allowing them to receive \$5.93, which they were supposed to obtain, they were allowed a price of only \$5.35. Why do you think that was, Mr. President? The administrators concluded—where they got the idea I do not know—that because more people were engaged in the production of beet sugar than were engaged in the production of cane sugar, the formula should be 110 percent of parity for beet producers and not 110 percent of parity but less than parity for the sugarcane producers. That kind of judgment makes me almost lose faith in some of the advisers to the President. But that is not all. I am citing merely a few instances with which I am familiar. I do not intend to discuss all cases.

In March and April of this year, when the Japanese were grasping the islands in the Pacific, invading Burma, and other places where much rice is produced, the Department of Agriculture of the United States, and the O. P. A. Administrator sent their agents into Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, California and asked the people to raise more rice in order to replenish the loss. In a circular the Department said:

Ceilings on milled rice, as reflected on rough-rice prices, also are considered attractive to stimulate 1942 crop plantings. Present Department of Agriculture plans call for a substantial acreage increase.

Those ceilings were established in May. That was a bait—I call it a bait—given to the rice growers of my State of California, and of other rice producing States. The statement I just read was issued on May

22, and at that time the O. P. A. had fixed ceilings on milled rice. Rexoro was \$9.75 a hundred pounds, Nira was \$9.75, and so on down to Early Prolific, \$6.65. I shall put the whole table in the RECORD.

These prices would have given the farmer a fair return on his labor; but what happened? Last August, after the farmers had planted their crop, after they had plowed and planted more land than ever before, in order to comply with the request of the O. P. A. and the Department of Agriculture, the ceilings were changed. The change was made not for the benefit of the farmers, not to satisfy them, by any means, but because the margin of profit between the milled rice and what the consumer paid did not give a sufficient profit to the "in-betweens." A large number of manufacturers, rice brokers, and others similarly interested applied for relief, and let us see what happened. Did the Department cut the margin of profit so that the consumer could get the rice at a lower price? No; they took it off the hides of the farmers by reducing the ceilings which had been established in May by 10 percent. They reduced the ceilings on milled rice on August 19, on Rexoro, for instance, from \$9.75 to \$8.25, on Edith from \$8 to \$7, on Pearl from \$7 to \$6.50, on Early Prolific from \$6.65 to \$6.20, and so on.

Did the consumers' prices change? Did they benefit? I should say they did not. The retail rice prices which I am about to cite were not handed to me by anyone, but I myself spent some time in the stores in the city of Washington in order to find out the truth about the matter.

Before I proceed, I might say that I made the same investigation as to sugar, and I will cite the results in both instances. In Louisiana the farmer is now paid on a basis of \$3.74 a hundred pounds

for raw sugar. That ceiling was established last January after all the farmers had sold their crops. They did not benefit from the rise which took place last January. My distinguished colleague will remember that last October he and I called upon Mr. Henderson and requested—begged—that if any changes were to be made in the price of raw sugar, which was then fixed at \$3.50, that the change be made before October 15, so that the farmers could receive the benefit of any upward change. But he did not listen to our pleas. In January, after all the sugar was gone, the price was changed from 3.50 cents per pound to 3.74 cents per pound. In December 1941 the ceiling price of refined sugar was fixed at \$5.45 a hundred pounds for Baltimore and New Orleans.

Bear in mind that today the ceiling is placed on rice from the mill, not from the farmer, because the farmer does not figure in it; it is milled rice. The millers receive an average of say, \$6.75 a hundred pounds for all rices, and the farmer receives about 75 cents less, which would mean, in round figures, about 6 cents a pound on an average.

What do you think the consumers are paying in the city of Washington? I did not rely for my information upon hearsay. I went and bought the sugar and the rice as I have just indicated in order to find out for myself. A 12-ounce package of rice sold for 1 cent an ounce, or 16 cents a pound. The ceiling for sugar was \$5.45 in Baltimore and New Orleans. In Washington the retail price is 8 cents a pound. In a few instances it sells for 7 cents per pound. Senators, that is really where the trouble lies. It is not with the farmer. Let us not blame the farmer for these skyrocketing prices. The blame should be placed on the in-betweens—the leeches, the bloodsuckers—who take advantage of the situation. The least rise that occurs in favor of the farmer is taken advantage of by them to fix the price to the consumer much higher or, I will say, in a greater proportion than it should be. All will agree, I am certain, it should not cost almost twice what a farmer receives to market rice. Nor should it cost almost 2½ cents per pound to retail sugar.

Those are only a few instances of price increases. Many more could be cited. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] cited some startling examples when he spoke before the Senate last week. After all, Senators, I firmly believe that most of the trouble lies in the high cost of distribution and not because of the price received by the farmers. If the situation were thoroughly investigated, if it were possible, as I know it is, for the O. P. A. to investigate prices asked in the city of Washington, for example, and ascertain the enormous profits that are being made by some of the retailers and wholesalers, something could be done which would relieve the situation. It is a grave injustice to the farmers of the Nation to point the finger of scorn in their direction.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. In speaking of the middleman getting the profit, let me say there is now a great demand for sweet potatoes throughout the South. A tenant on my place planted quite an acreage of sweet potatoes, and I thought he was receiving an astoundingly good price. He was paid \$1.50 a hamper. A hamper holds 1 bushel. My daughter went to a store the other day to buy some sweet potatoes, and she paid 10 cents a pound. She paid about 30 cents for two and a half sweet potatoes. I can take one "jumbo," as it is called, grown on my farm, and at that price I would receive 60 cents a potato. If that ceiling is put upon potatoes as they come from the farm, I will not plant anything but sweet potatoes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I realize that Mr. Henderson has a very difficult job, and I desire to give him credit for having worked hard toward accomplishing the purpose sought for in the Price Control Act. But I do believe that instead of arm-chair farmers he should have practical men advising him, men who know something about the situation, who go into the field and really gather information and ascertain the margin of profit represented by the difference between the price paid the producer of the commodity and the amount paid by the consumer. If we can bridge that gap, in other words, draw the consumer nearer to the producer, I believe we can accomplish something worthwhile.

Before the war some stores would have leads on tomatoes, others on sugar, others on this and others on that. There was a great deal of competition. The average family got at retail a pretty fair return for its money. But there is no longer any question of competition. From what I can understand, most canned goods will be rationed in the same way that sugar and other commodities are, so that a storekeeper, whether he be one who handles a million dollars worth of commodities a year, or \$5,000 worth of commodities a month, is going to pay the same price for each commodity that everyone else will pay, because there will be a ceiling on it. That is as it should be. Since there is no way for competition to exist to the same extent as in years past, it strikes me that a better solution of the problem could be attained than by selecting March, let us say, and the price for which one of the storekeepers in this city sold a commodity during that month, and announce that the highest price for which he sold it would be the price charged.

Today in Washington a can of tomatoes can be bought for so much at one store and at another store the price will be 2 cents more. It is the same with sugar and the same with everything else. It strikes me that a better formula to regulate prices could be worked out, and that in working out that formula we could give to the producer of the commodity a fair margin, a margin which

would reflect at least the cost of labor we are now attempting to provide for in the way of additional costs. That is all we ask.

Mr. President, as I indicated a while ago, I have many figures which I could submit to the Senate to show that the so-called farm income is a mere pittance when compared with what it ought to be. On November 30, 1937, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 530, volume 82, part 1, Seventy-fifth Congress, second session, a table entitled "National Income: Agriculture's Contribution to National Income, Nonagricultural Income, Percent Agricultural Is of National Income, Percent Nonagricultural Is of National Income, and Tariff Acts in Effect."

That table showed that in 1850 the farmer received for his commodities 33.6 percent of the national income, whereas the nonagricultural income was 66.4 percent of the national income.

In 1860, just before the Civil War, the farmer received 37 percent of the national income, whereas nonagricultural income was 63 percent. I have given corresponding figures down to and including the year 1936, the last year for which such figures were at that time available. At the right of the table was a column in which were placed the various tariff acts which were passed during the years 1850 to 1930. That column shows that there was a general increase in tariff rates, and as the tariff rates increased the percentage of nonfarm income in the United States increased, whereas the income of the farmer decreased, until it reached the low of 5.8 percent of the national income in 1933.

Mr. President, I direct the attention of the Senate particularly to how these figures of percentage of national income is calculated insofar as the farmer is concerned. For instance, according to the table which I hold in my hand, in 1940, from a total income for the Nation of \$76,000,000,000 in round figures, the farmer received 7.19 percent. But when we deduct from what is termed "income" the rent for his home, the value of agricultural crops produced and consumed on the farm, the value of livestock produced and consumed on the farm, taxes, interest, and hired labor, we find that that income is cut almost in half.

Let us consider the figures for the year 1910. The actual net to the farmers that year was \$2,118,000,000. The reported net, however, was \$4,474,000,000. The difference between the two figures is accounted for as follows: Crops produced and consumed on the farm, as I have just indicated, amounted to \$340,000,000. Livestock produced and consumed on the farm, \$837,000,000. Rental value of the farm houses in which the farmers live, \$382,000,000. Farm wages paid to hired labor—not wages paid to the wives, not wages paid to the children who work on the farm, not wages paid to the one operating the farm, but hired labor, \$546,000,000. Change in value of inventory on the farm—and, Mr. President, what does that mean? If the value of the farm goes up and the

inventory is greater, that increase is considered as income, whether the farm is sold or not, and that increase amounted in 1910 to \$151,000,000. So, Senators, if we deduct from the total amount credited to the farmers of the Nation the items just referred to, it will be found that instead of receiving for the year 1910 13.58 percent of the national income, as a matter of fact, the farmers actually received 6.71 percent of the national income.

Mr. President, what are we trying to do to alter this condition? We are trying to incorporate in the formula of actual costs to the farmer his labor costs, not only for himself but for his children—all the labor necessary in order to produce a crop. I ask, why is that not fair?

Further reverting to the table I have just referred to, for the year 1940, out of a total of \$76,000,000,000 national income the farmers of the Nation received 2.98 percent—not 3 percent, I call to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. Why, Mr. President, I should say that but a handful of large corporations received more than that amount of the national income.

Mr. President, as I pointed out a while ago, although they represent one-third of the Nation engaged in the necessary occupation of keeping the Nation fed, the farmers received in cash in 1940 only 2.98 percent of the national income.

Mr. President, when the Department of Agriculture states that the farmers of the Nation will receive this year out of the national income as much as \$15,000,000,000, I contend that they will not receive half that amount. They will receive less than 50 percent of that amount, because when we consider and place against the farmer's income the high price of pork which is consumed on the farm, when we figure the high price of butter, the additional cost of labor, and then make all these other deductions to which I have referred, we shall, I am sure, find that instead of the farmer receiving one-half the estimated amount of \$15,000,000,000, that is instead of \$7,500,000,000 in cash going to the farmer, and \$7,500,000,000 going for the labor on the farm and for things he consumes in the way of livestock and so forth—instead of it being 50-50, it will be 60 percent for labor and for what he consumes and only 40 percent net for the farmers. Think of it, Senators, from an estimated national income of \$115,000,000,000 the farmers, who clothe and feed us, will receive in cash about \$6,000,000,000. It is a shameful condition and should be rectified at once.

Mr. President, I cannot see why the Department of Agriculture cannot take into consideration the figures I have just referred to, and why they cannot be brought to the attention of the President of the United States, so he can see the picture in its true light, so he can see the vast discrepancy between what the farmer receives for what he produces and what the consumer has to pay for it.

I believe that in a true recognition of that picture lies the remedy.

Mr. President, at this point I ask that the table which I previously placed in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 530, on November 30, 1937, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

National income—Agriculture's contribution to national income, nonagricultural income, percent agricultural is of national income, percent nonagricultural is of national income, and tariff acts in effect

Year	National income ¹	Agriculture's contribution to national income ¹	Nonagricultural income ^{1,2}	Percent agricultural is of national income ³	Percent nonagricultural is of national income	Tariff acts ⁴
	Million dollars	Million dollars	Million dollars	Percent	Percent	
1850.....	1,579	530	1,049	33.6	66.4	Act of 1846: Moderation of protection.
1860.....	2,707	1,002	1,705	37.0	63.0	Act of 1857: Further reductions. 1861: Increase began.
1870.....	5,424	1,534	3,890	28.3	71.7	1862: Great increase. 1864: Extreme increase.
1880.....	6,434	1,786	4,648	27.8	72.2	1870: Slight increase. 1872: 10-percent reduction, which was repealed in 1875.
1890.....	10,504	2,294	8,210	21.8	78.2	1882: Increase. 1883: Decrease because of too full Treasury.
1900.....	15,522	2,815	12,707	18.1	81.9	1890: McKinley. Further extension of protective system. 1894: Wilson Act; decrease in duties.
1909.....	26,430	4,988	21,442	18.9	81.1	1897: Dingley; favored protection.
1910.....	28,024	5,218	22,806	18.6	81.4	1909: Payne-Aldrich. Revision downward.
1911.....	28,376	4,815	23,561	17.0	83.0	
1912.....	30,358	5,294	25,064	17.4	82.6	
1913.....	31,909	5,133	26,776	16.1	83.9	1913: Underwood. Drastic reduction.
1914.....	31,669	5,081	26,588	16.0	84.0	
1915.....	33,083	5,488	27,595	16.6	83.4	
1916.....	38,884	6,631	32,253	17.1	82.9	
1917.....	46,575	9,188	37,387	19.7	80.3	
1918.....	54,784	11,205	43,579	20.5	79.5	
1919.....	59,550	12,182	47,368	20.5	79.5	
1920.....	65,928	11,057	54,871	16.8	83.2	
1921.....	55,430	6,967	48,463	12.6	87.4	1921: Emergency, increase.
1922.....	57,926	7,300	50,626	12.6	87.4	1922: Fordney-McCumber. Further increase.
1923.....	65,949	8,026	57,923	12.2	87.8	
1924.....	67,946	7,810	60,136	11.5	88.5	
1925.....	72,293	8,315	63,978	11.5	88.5	
1926.....	74,586	7,846	66,740	10.5	89.5	
1927.....	75,479	7,843	67,636	10.4	89.6	
1928.....	77,123	7,941	69,182	10.3	89.7	
1929.....	79,350	8,206	71,144	10.3	89.7	
1930.....	73,088	6,338	66,750	8.7	91.3	1930: Smoot-Hawley.
1931.....	60,971	4,135	56,836	6.8	93.2	
1932.....	47,674	2,756	44,918	5.8	94.2	
1933.....	45,662	3,761	41,901	8.2	91.8	
1934.....	52,801	5,017	47,784	9.5	90.5	
1935.....	56,856	5,705	51,151	10.0	90.0	
1936.....	64,598	6,783	57,815	10.5	89.5	

¹ 1850-1923 from Agriculture's Share in the National Income, October 1935, Division of Information, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture. 1924-36 from Monthly Indexes of Nonagricultural and National Income, August 1937, Program Planning Division, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

² 1850-1923 calculated by Southern Division. Total national income minus agriculture's contribution to national income.

³ 1850-1923, see footnote 1. 1924-36 calculated by Southern Division.

⁴ Taussig. Tariff History of the United States, G. P. Putnam, 1931.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask that a statement made by me on January 22, 1942, together with accompanying tables, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. In connection with the total revenues of farmers, I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma to an exhibit which was incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD by me, at page A5099, showing the distribution of the so-called cash income to the farmer. It has often been pointed out that the farmers of the Nation received a stated percentage of the national income each year. Beginning in 1910, they received from the total national income 13.53 percent, in 1911, 12.13 percent, and so on, down to 1940, when they obtained 7.19 percent thereof.

When we analyze those figures—and by the way those figures may be obtained by any of you from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics—we find that we must deduct from the so-called total income the value of the crops produced and consumed on the farm, the livestock produced and consumed on the farm, the rental value of farm dwellings, and farm wages paid to hired labor, in order to obtain the actual cash received.

When that is done, gentlemen, the farmers of the Nation receive but a pittance for their labor.

Let us take, for example, the year 1940, when it is said that the farmers received 7.19 percent of the total national income. As a matter of fact, after deducting the items which are consumed on the farm, farm wages to hired labor, and rental value of farm dwellings, they received, in actual cash, only 2.98 percent of the total income. In other words, out of a total national income of \$76,470,000,000, the farmers of the Nation received \$2,277,000,000 in cash for their labor, out of which they must pay taxes and other expenses. By using the same method of calculation for the years 1936-40, I desire to point out for the RECORD the figures to show the actual cash which the farmers of the Nation received for those years. I will give the percentages of net farm cash income as related to the total amount of income for the entire Nation.

In 1936 the total national income was \$65,734,000,000. Of that amount, the farmer received in cash \$2,940,000,000, or 4.47 percent of the total national income. In other words, the farmers, who constitute about 25 percent of the people of our Nation, who feed and clothe us, received but 4.47 percent of the entire income of the Nation for that year.

For 1937 the total income of the Nation was \$71,655,000,000. The farmers received

\$2,968,000,000, or 4.14 percent of the entire income.

For 1938 the entire income was \$66,446,000,000, and the farmers received \$2,169,000,000, or 3.26 percent of the entire income. It sounds fantastic and unbelievable.

In 1939 the national income was \$71,134,000,000. The farmers received \$1,983,000,000, or 2.79 percent of the income of the entire Nation. I think it is shameful.

In 1940 the entire national income was \$76,470,000,000, of which the farmers received the paltry sum of \$2,277,000,000, or 2.98 percent of the entire national income. Compare that measly, insignificant sum with the huge net corporate profits for the same year of \$11,500,000,000. I repeat, it is a disgrace, and I wonder why the farmers of our country have tolerated such conditions for so long a time. And yet, Mr. President, with such inequities, columnists and others who do not seek the truth are saying that the farmers are receiving too much. As a matter of fact, when we boil it down, it is the in-betweens—that is, the brokers, merchants, retailers, the railroads, and so forth—who make the profits, and the farmer usually gets barely enough to provide clothing and shelter for his family and money to pay taxes.

I invite the columnists and editorial writers of the country to analyze the actual returns received by farmers and then I challenge them to write the truth on the subject.

Mr. President, I ask consent to print in the Record at this point tables A, B, and C, to which I have been referring.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TABLE A.—Showing farm income, cost of production, and actual net cash received by farmers for years shown

Year	Total cash farm income from sale of all crops and livestock, etc.	Total cost of production, including wages	Actual net cash to farmers (column 1 less column 2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Millions of dollars	Millions of dollars	Millions of dollars
1910	5,793	3,575	2,218
1911	5,596	3,620	1,976
1912	6,017	3,863	2,154
1913	6,248	3,999	2,249
1914	6,050	4,091	1,959
1915	6,403	4,189	2,214
1916	7,750	4,805	2,945
1917	10,746	6,082	4,664
1918	13,461	7,520	5,941
1919	14,602	8,400	6,202
1920	12,608	9,079	3,529
1921	8,150	6,854	1,296
1922	8,594	6,797	1,797
1923	9,563	7,088	2,475
1924	10,221	7,449	2,772
1925	10,995	7,415	3,580
1926	10,564	7,475	3,089
1927	10,756	7,501	3,255
1928	11,072	7,814	3,258
1929	11,296	7,748	3,548
1930	9,021	6,997	2,024
1931	6,371	5,598	773
1932	4,743	4,543	200
1933	5,314	4,359	955
1934	6,317	4,663	1,654
1935	7,042	5,010	2,032
1936	8,284	5,344	2,940
1937	8,809	5,841	2,968
1938	7,648	5,479	2,169
1939	7,851	5,868	1,983
1940	8,354	6,077	2,277

TABLE B.—Showing actual net income to farmers and items added to actual net income by Bureau of Economics in order to arrive at Government figures of net income

Year	Actual net cash to farmers (million dollars)	Government benefit payments (million dollars)	Crops produced and consumed on farm (million dollars)	Livestock produced and consumed on farm (million dollars)	Rental value of farm dwellings (million dollars)	Farm wages to hired labor on farm (million dollars)	Change in value of inventory on farm	Government figures of net farm income (sum of columns 1 to 7) (million dollars)	Percent of national income received by farmers according to Government figures on net farm income (million dollars)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1910	2,218	340	837	382	546	+151	4,474	13.53	
1911	1,976	362	730	393	547	-67	3,941	12.13	
1912	2,154	370	770	404	568	+96	4,362	12.66	
1913	2,249	338	815	420	575	+26	4,423	11.71	
1914	1,959	346	815	427	572	+426	4,545	12.50	
1915	2,214	337	794	434	577	+73	4,429	11.58	
1916	1,945	423	886	473	634	-266	4,095	9.12	
1917	4,664	617	1,244	540	797	+321	8,183	15.34	
1918	5,941	622	1,531	618	747	+39	9,498	16.34	
1919	6,202	727	1,668	713	1,078	-450	9,938	15.03	
1920	3,529	848	1,558	894	1,242	+348	8,419	11.47	
1921	1,296	506	1,062	760	805	-613	3,816	6.54	
1922	1,797	548	1,007	734	775	+18	4,879	8.06	
1923	2,475	581	1,042	781	841	-75	5,645	7.99	
1924	2,772	547	1,075	780	844	-412	5,006	7.94	
1925	3,580	590	1,191	791	856	-93	6,915	9.20	
1926	3,089	615	1,222	803	893	+25	6,647	8.27	
1927	3,255	552	1,143	800	867	-259	6,358	8.10	
1928	3,258	545	1,122	811	856	+136	6,728	8.30	
1929	3,548	565	1,134	829	863	-166	6,773	7.88	
1930	2,024	530	1,007	830	774	+12	5,177	6.87	

TABLE B—Continued

Year	Actual net cash to farmers (million dollars)	Government benefit payments (million dollars)	Crops produced and consumed on farm (million dollars)	Livestock produced and consumed on farm (million dollars)	Rental value of farm dwellings (million dollars)	Farm wages to hired labor on farm (million dollars)	Change in value of inventory on farm	Government figures of net farm income (sum of columns 1 to 7) (million dollars)	Percent of national income received by farmers according to Government figures on net farm income (million dollars)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1931	773	200	381	627	655	313	+250	3,518	5.88
1932	200	381	607	587	317	-36	+39	2,315	5.31
1933	955	131	416	607	587	317	-36	3,010	7.17
1934	1,654	446	399	701	616	404	-964	3,556	7.20
1935	2,032	573	444	893	616	456	+63	3,077	5.46
1936	2,940	287	436	969	615	490	-297	5,440	8.28
1937	2,968	367	471	981	648	557	+230	6,222	8.68
1938	2,169	482	408	875	632	528	+4	5,098	7.67
1939	1,983	807	425	806	636	515	+208	5,372	7.55
1940	2,277	766	430	799	665	525	+38	5,500	7.19

TABLE C.—Statement showing national income compared with actual net cash farm income, also percent of national income actually received by farmers

Year	National income	Actual net cash farm income	Percent of national income actually received by farmers
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Millions of dollars	Millions of dollars	
1910	33,064	2,218	6.71
1911	32,490	1,976	6.08
1912	34,356	2,154	5.25
1913	37,762	2,249	5.96
1914	36,367	1,959	5.39
1915	38,254	2,214	5.79
1916	44,913	1,945	4.33
1917	53,300	4,664	8.74
1918	58,121	1,941	3.34
1919	66,136	6,202	9.38
1920	73,393	3,529	4.81
1921	58,333	1,296	2.22
1922	60,517	1,797	2.97
1923	70,675	2,475	3.50
1924	70,634	2,772	3.92
1925	75,187	3,580	4.76
1926	80,396	3,089	3.84
1927	78,502	3,255	4.15
1928	81,044	3,258	4.01
1929	85,954	3,548	4.13
1930	75,385	2,024	2.68
1931	59,867	773	1.29
1932	43,620	200	.46
1933	42,006	955	2.27
1934	49,416	1,654	3.35
1935	56,366	2,032	3.61
1936	65,734	2,940	4.47
1937	71,655	2,968	4.14
1938	66,446	2,169	3.26
1939	71,134	1,983	2.79
1940	76,470	2,277	2.98

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Statement showing farm income and expenditures released July 25, 1941.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have before me another set of figures. I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is not present. A while ago he asked a few questions about the figures to which I shall now refer. The figures are very illuminating. The figures represent an index, taking into consideration the parity formula of 1910-14 as 100 percent. Prices received by farmers in 1910 were 102, that is 2 points

over the parity figure of 100 which is used as a guide in this table. During the World War the figure rose from 100 to 202. The prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes, rose to the figure of 174. Let us keep those figures in mind. During the World War the figure representing prices received by farmers for their products rose to 202, whereas prices paid by farmers rose to the figure 174. That figure represents the prices the farmer paid for the things he bought in order to produce crops on his farm. After the World War the index figure of the prices received by the farmer rose to 211 in 1920, but by 1933 had fallen to 70, in other words, 30 points under the 100-percent formula of 1910-14. That figure gradually increased, until in January of this year it reached 149. Last August it rose to 163.

Prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes, remained almost constant. There was practically no increase.

The distinguished Senator from Texas asked a question about factory wages. In 1910 the figure for factory wages per employed worker was 99.6, or four-tenths of 1 percent below parity of 100. During the World War, in 1919, the figure rose to 183. In July of this year, the last month for which figures are available, it rose to 327. Think of it! Prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes, have remained constant at 152.

I wish to show the rise in farm wages, or the prices which farmers must pay for their labor. I pointed out that the factory wage increase was from 99.6 to 327, more than three and a quarter times. Bear in mind that the parity formula is not based on the wages which the farmer pays for hired labor. They are not included at all. The only thing taken into consideration is the price paid by him, including interest, for what he buys, and that is figured on the basis of the prices received by him for his commodities. The farm wage is out entirely.

In 1910, the beginning of the period on which the parity formula was based, we started at a level of 100 for farm wages. What is it today? It is 196. In other words, last July the farmer had to pay almost twice as much for his labor as he paid in the period from 1910 to 1914, the period on which the parity formula was based. The increase in prices of farm commodities has not been commensurate with the increase in the cost of labor. I contend that unless we put into the law some language which will force the authorities to include farm labor, we shall not have production at the rate necessary to feed our Army and our population. That goes without saying. That is all we are asking for in this formula.

Mr. President, as I pointed out a while ago, it is an easy matter for any Senator to take a set of figures, as did the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] the other day, and show an increase in farm prices of 72 percent, and an increase in wages of labor of 75 percent. It depends upon where we start. In 1939

the figure representing the prices of farm commodities was at the lowest point which it had reached prior to 1933, during the Hoover term. On the other hand the index for factory wages was 208.2, and it continued near that figure. There was not as much change in the index figure representing farm wages as there was in prices received by farmers. Wages were more constant; and the fluctuations were less than they were in the column showing the fluctuation in farm prices.

As I say, it is an easy matter to take the low figure for 1939 and bring it up to January 1942, showing a rise to 149, and contrast it with the increase in labor wages, which was from 262 to 300. The percentages are almost the same, but the bases are different. It is possible to prove almost anything with figures.

Mr. President, at this point I ask that the table to which I have just referred be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Index numbers of prices received and paid by farmers, the ratio of prices received to paid, farm wage rates, factory wages, and food-marketing margin; also the farmers' share of the consumer food dollar, United States, 1910-42

Year and month	Prices received by farmers 1910-14=100	Prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes 1910-14=100	Ratio of prices received to prices paid, including interest and taxes 1910-14=100	Farm wage rates 1910-14=100	Factory wages per employed worker 1910-14=100	Marketing margin (88 foods) 1913=100	Farmers' share of consumers' food dollar (88 foods)
1910.....	102	97	105	97	99.6	---	---
1911.....	95	100	95	98	96.0	---	---
1912.....	100	100	100	101	97.8	---	---
1913.....	101	102	99	103	103.2	100	53
1914.....	101	101	100	101	103.4	102	53
1915.....	98	107	92	103	106.8	104	52
1916.....	118	124	95	113	121.2	109	54
1917.....	175	148	118	141	143.3	124	60
1918.....	202	174	116	177	183.0	151	58
1919.....	213	201	106	207	207.4	171	57
1920.....	211	205	103	242	247.1	204	53
1921.....	125	164	76	155	208.2	189	44
1922.....	132	162	81	151	202.0	171	45
1923.....	142	165	86	169	223.8	178	45
1924.....	143	165	87	173	224.8	178	45
1925.....	156	170	92	176	228.7	178	48
1926.....	145	168	86	179	231.3	182	48
1927.....	139	166	84	179	232.1	182	47
1928.....	149	168	89	179	234.3	180	48
1929.....	146	166	88	180	235.1	186	47
1930.....	126	158	80	167	218.4	186	44
1931.....	87	138	63	130	196.0	169	38
1932.....	65	120	54	96	158.9	153	33
1933.....	70	118	59	85	154.3	146	35
1934.....	90	128	70	95	169.9	158	37
1935.....	108	130	83	103	183.0	162	42
1936.....	114	129	88	111	195.6	160	44
1937.....	121	134	90	126	213.0	162	45
1938.....	95	127	75	125	194.8	160	40
1939.....	93	127	73	123	208.2	156	41
1940.....	98	128	77	126	221.2	153	42
1941.....	122	134	91	154	262.9	149	48
1942-Jan.....	149	146	102	173	300.4	156	51
Feb.....	145	147	99	---	297.2	158	51
Mar.....	146	150	97	173	296.6	158	51
Apr.....	150	151	99	181	305.3	157	52
May.....	152	152	100	---	312.7	161	52
June.....	151	152	99	181	317.6	165	51
July.....	154	152	101	196	327.0	163	52
Aug.....	163	152	107	---	---	158	54

¹ The monthly index numbers are corrected for seasonal variation.

² Based on Bureau of Labor Statistics Factory Employment and Pay Roll Data except for the years 1910-1913 and 1915 which were estimated from other data.

Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have another interesting table. I shall not discuss it in detail. It shows the average net income per person engaged in agriculture and the wage income per employed industrial worker. In 1910 the average net income per person engaged in agriculture was \$371. The wage income per employed industrial worker was \$573. In 1942, with all the high prices we hear about, the average net income per person engaged in agriculture is \$1,032, whereas the wage income per employed industrial worker is \$1,766.

I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average income per worker

Year	Average net income per person engaged in agriculture	Wage income per employed industrial worker	Index numbers (1910-14=100)	
			Average net farm income per person employed	Wage income per employed industrial worker
1910.....	Dollars 371	Dollars 573	Percent 101.4	Percent 98.6
1911.....	348	562	95.1	96.4
1912.....	371	575	101.4	98.6
1913.....	382	600	104.4	103.0
1914.....	360	603	98.4	103.6
1915.....	381	622	104.1	106.7
1916.....	465	694	127.0	119.1
1917.....	690	818	188.5	140.2
1918.....	882	1,064	241.0	182.4
1919.....	959	1,188	264.8	203.7
1920.....	753	1,411	205.7	242.0
1921.....	417	1,234	113.9	211.4
1922.....	453	1,182	123.8	202.6
1923.....	532	1,274	145.4	218.3
1924.....	559	1,273	152.7	218.1
1925.....	642	1,293	175.4	221.9
1926.....	609	1,318	166.4	226.2
1927.....	621	1,311	169.7	224.9
1928.....	616	1,323	168.3	226.8
1929.....	649	1,334	177.3	228.8
1930.....	489	1,249	133.6	214.2
1931.....	322	1,120	88.0	193.5
1932.....	218	929	59.6	159.2
1933.....	289	900	79.0	154.2
1934.....	400	983	109.3	168.6
1935.....	468	1,057	127.9	181.3
1936.....	536	1,129	146.4	193.5
1937.....	565	1,217	154.4	206.9
1938.....	489	1,131	133.6	194.1
1939.....	498	1,203	136.1	206.3
1940.....	527	1,268	144.0	217.6
1941.....	742	1,484	202.7	254.4
1942 ¹	1,052	1,766	287.4	303.1

¹ Estimated.

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Volume of agricultural production, farm employment, and volume of agricultural production per farm worker, United States, 1910-42

[Index numbers 1910-14=100]

Year	Volume of agricultural production	Farm employment	Volume of agricultural production per farm worker
1910.....	95.5	101	95
1911.....	99.8	100	100
1912.....	102.5	100	103
1913.....	98.3	100	98
1914.....	104.1	100	104
1915.....	104.3	99	105
1916.....	100.1	100	100
1917.....	103.3	98	105
1918.....	109.3	94	116
1919.....	109.5	92	119
1920.....	111.0	94	118
1921.....	100.7	95	106
1922.....	109.9	95	116
1923.....	114.1	94	121

Volume of agricultural production, etc.—Con.

Year	Volume of agricultural production	Farm employment	Volume of agricultural production per farm worker
1924.....	117.8	94	125
1925.....	117.3	95	123
1926.....	120.9	96	126
1927.....	117.8	93	127
1928.....	123.1	94	131
1929.....	119.1	94	127
1930.....	118.1	93	127
1931.....	123.1	93	132
1932.....	116.5	92	127
1933.....	115.8	91	127
1934.....	112.6	90	125
1935.....	110.5	92	120
1936.....	113.0	92	123
1937.....	127.5	90	142
1938.....	124.0	90	138
1939.....	128.7	89	145
1940.....	132.7	88	151
1941.....	136.2	86	158
1942.....	152.2	86	177

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us compare the income per person on the farm with the income per person not on the farm. Listen to these figures:

In 1910 the net income from agriculture per person on the farm was \$139. The income per person not on the farm was \$482, almost two-and-a-half times as much.

In 1941 the income per person on the farm was \$237, and the income per person not on the farm was \$825.

I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Income per farm, and income per person on farms and not on farms, United States, 1910-42

EXCLUDING GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS

Year	Net income from agriculture per farm	Net income from agriculture per person on farms	Income per person not on farms	Index of income per capita		Ratio per capita farm to per capita non-farm (1910-14=100)
				Farm (1910-14=100)	Nonfarm (1910-14=100)	
1910.....	Dol. 699	Dol. 139	Dol. 482	Pct. 103.4	Pct. 98.8	104.7
1911.....	613	122	468	90.8	95.9	94.7
1912.....	675	136	484	100.4	99.2	101.2
1913.....	680	136	522	101.2	99.0	94.6
1914.....	697	140	483	104.2	99.0	105.3
1915.....	674	135	502	100.4	102.9	97.6
1916.....	771	155	580	115.3	118.9	97.0
1917.....	1,274	258	639	192.0	131.0	146.6
1918.....	1,482	304	670	226.2	137.4	164.6
1919.....	1,527	319	763	237.4	156.4	151.8
1920.....	1,298	265	876	197.2	179.6	109.8
1921.....	584	119	718	88.5	147.2	60.1
1922.....	745	153	716	113.8	146.8	77.5
1923.....	876	180	812	133.9	166.5	80.4
1924.....	876	180	788	133.9	161.5	82.9
1925.....	1,078	223	810	165.9	166.1	99.9
1926.....	1,044	216	856	190.7	175.5	91.6
1927.....	1,009	209	818	155.5	167.7	92.7
1928.....	1,067	222	829	165.2	169.5	97.2
1929.....	1,072	223	870	165.9	178.4	93.0
1930.....	813	170	761	126.5	156.0	81.1
1931.....	645	114	605	84.8	124.0	68.4
1932.....	350	74	442	55.1	90.6	60.8
1933.....	427	91	417	67.7	85.5	79.2
1934.....	461	98	487	72.9	99.8	73.0
1935.....	666	143	539	105.4	110.5	96.3
1936.....	767	162	626	120.5	128.3	93.9
1937.....	892	187	670	139.1	137.4	101.2
1938.....	725	150	621	111.6	127.3	87.7

Income per farm, etc.—Continued

EXCLUDING GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS

Year	Net income from agriculture per farm	Net income from agriculture per person on farms	Income per person not on farms	Index of income per capita	Ratio per capita farm to per capita non-farm (1910-14=100)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1939.....	720	147	657	109.4	81.2
1940.....	773	157	716	116.8	79.6
1941.....	1,161	237	825	176.3	104.3
1942.....	350	980	260.4	200.9	129.6
1943.....					
1944.....					

INCLUDING GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS

Year	Net income from agriculture per farm	Net income from agriculture per person on farms	Income per person not on farms	Index of income per capita	Ratio per capita farm to per capita non-farm (1910-14=100)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1933.....	444	94	417	69.9	81.8
1934.....	519	111	487	82.6	82.8
1935.....	739	158	540	117.6	106.2
1936.....	804	170	626	126.5	98.6
1937.....	940	197	671	146.6	106.5
1938.....	791	164	621	122.0	95.8
1939.....	833	171	658	127.2	94.3
1940.....	883	179	717	133.2	90.6
1941.....	1,245	254	826	189.0	111.6
1942.....	368	981	273.8	201.1	136.2
1943.....					
1944.....					

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Column (1): Net income from agriculture per farm is column (5), table 2 divided by number of farms, column (3), table 3. This includes the net income to farm operators and to laborers living on farms.

Column (2): Income from agriculture per person on farms is net income, column (5), table 2, divided by number of persons on farms, column (1), table 3. Persons on farms include farm operators and their families, farm laborers and their families, and also some other persons living on farms. The total income per person living on farms is considerably larger than that from agriculture, as many receive income from nonfarm sources.

Column (3): Income per person not on farms includes nonagricultural income and the income from agriculture received by persons not on farms, as indicated in column (3), table 2, divided by nonfarm population, column (2), table 3. The indicated income per person not on farms is slightly too large on account of the fact that some non-agricultural income is really paid to persons on farms.

Column (4): Averaging the net income from agriculture per person on farms (2) for the years 1910-14, and relating the income for each year to this average, provides a series of index numbers for use in comparison with income per person not on farms.

Column (5): Averaging the income per person not on farms (3) for the years 1910-14, and relating the income for each year to this average, provides a series of index numbers for use in comparison with income per person on farms.

Column (6): This provides the parity measure of the relation of the net income of individuals on farms from farm operations to the income of individuals not on farms as specified in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for only a few more minutes. I should like to go more into detail with respect to the tables which I have offered, because I think they are very significant. They give us a picture which should be scrutinized by our critics in order to show the pittance which the farmers of our Nation are receiving, in contrast to nonfarm labor.

Another very interesting table shows the nonfarm income and the cost of family food purchases. It will be recalled that the reason wages had to be increased was the enormous advance in food prices. I have some figures to show the retail cost of 58 foods, compared with family income. These figures are taken from a survey which was made in 1918. The figures are based on a family of 4.9 persons.

In 1913 the family received \$1,046. That was the amount of cash that the nonfarm family received. The retail cost of all foods for that family was \$326. The retail cost of the 58 foods grown on the farms which were consumed by the nonfarm family was \$252. The percentage of food cost to income, for all foods, was 31 percent; and for 58 selected foods, 24 percent.

In 1941, the last year for which the figures are available, the per-family income has increased, from 1913, when it was \$1,046, to \$1,956, in 1941; and for all foods the percentage of food cost has decreased from 31 percent in 1913 to 22 percent in 1941. For the 58 selected foods the percentage of cost has decreased from 24 percent to 17 percent.

From 1913 to August 1942 the income of the average nonfarm family increased from \$1,046 to \$2,366. Today the cost of food for that family is \$514, or 22 percent of the family income. As I have just now pointed out, the cost of food has decreased from 31 percent to 22 percent, when we consider the added income.

Why some wages were permitted to go sky high, as it were, without attempting to stop them or curb them is beyond me. Certainly it was not because of any excessive rise in food costs. The reason for raising factory wages to the extent that they have been raised was not due to the rise in the cost of food.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks, the table to which I have just now referred.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nonfarm family income and cost of family food purchases, 1913-42

Year and month	Family income	Retail cost of all foods	Retail cost of 58 foods	Food cost as percentage of income	
				All foods	58 foods
				Pct.	Pct.
1913.....	1,046	326	252	31	24
1914.....	1,013	334	258	33	25
1915.....	1,029	330	258	32	25
1916.....	1,176	370	285	31	24
1917.....	1,329	477	370	36	28
1918.....	1,513	548	424	36	28
1919.....	1,624	611	470	38	29
1920.....	1,857	688	514	37	28
1921.....	1,599	523	404	33	25
1922.....	1,629	489	374	30	23
1923.....	1,810	506	384	28	21
1924.....	1,829	501	381	27	21
1925.....	1,905	542	410	28	22
1926.....	1,944	560	418	29	22
1927.....	1,927	539	406	28	21
1928.....	1,942	533	407	27	21
1929.....	1,979	540	415	27	21
1930.....	1,762	514	391	29	22
1931.....	1,505	424	322	28	21
1932.....	1,159	353	270	30	23
1933.....	1,105	343	264	31	24
1934.....	1,251	382	295	31	24
1935.....	1,338	409	331	31	25
1936.....	1,548	413	342	27	22
1937.....	1,614	429	353	27	22
1938.....	1,471	399	321	27	22
1939.....	1,558	388	311	25	20
1940.....	1,671	394	314	24	19
1941.....	1,956	430	342	22	17
1935-39 average.....	1,506	408	332	27	22
1942.....					
January.....	2,152	474	378	22	18
February.....	2,173	476	381	22	18
March.....	2,200	484	384	22	17
April.....	2,233	488	386	22	17
May.....	2,259	496	392	22	17
June.....	2,313	502	398	22	17
July.....	2,342	508	401	22	17
August.....	2,366	514	402	22	17

NOTE.—Comparisons in this table are very rough estimates which refer to the typical workingman's family of 4.9 persons representing the average obtained in the 1918-19 Cost of Living Survey of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The survey averages were \$1,513 for family income and \$548 for total food expenditure and it was assumed that these represented the calendar year 1918.

The series of family income estimates was obtained by applying to the \$1,513 in 1918 the changes in per capita nonagricultural income payments to individuals. The series of family cost of all foods was obtained by applying to the \$548 cost in 1918 the changes in the index of retail food prices as computed by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of 58 foods is from table 1 of this report. These series should be interpreted with care. Both the cost of all foods and the cost of 58 foods refer to fixed quantities of each food as purchased in 1918. Under circumstances of changing income and changing food prices a typical family would alter quantities purchased and alter the food outlay.

The comparisons do show the costs at which a family could purchase identical quantities of foods and what share of income this would require in each year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I pointed out a while ago, should the Thomas amendment be rejected, I shall propose to the Senate two amendments. If the first of them be agreed to, of course the second will not be offered. My only object is to try to put into the measure language which would make it not permissive but obligatory upon the part of the O. P. A. or whoever administers the measure to include farm labor as an item in figuring parity prices or maximum prices on farm commodities.

I say to the Members of the Senate that when parity is figured without re-

Employment and earnings of industrial workers and other nonagricultural workers, United States, 1929-42

Year	Wage income of industrial workers	Labor income of other nonagricultural workers	Employment of industrial workers	Employment of other nonagricultural workers	Wage income per industrial worker	Labor income per other nonagricultural worker
	Million dollars	Million dollars	Thousands	Thousands	Dollars	Dollars
1929.....	14,454	37,358	10,836	25,638	1,334	1,457
1930.....	11,856	35,188	9,524	24,637	1,249	1,428
1931.....	9,115	30,693	8,072	23,143	1,129	1,326
1932.....	6,315	24,819	6,799	21,201	929	1,171
1933.....	6,570	22,810	7,301	20,935	900	1,090
1934.....	8,243	25,751	8,385	22,291	983	1,155
1935.....	9,327	27,621	8,522	23,125	1,087	1,194
1936.....	10,767	31,212	9,540	24,449	1,129	1,281
1937.....	12,608	33,534	10,361	25,412	1,217	1,320
1938.....	9,831	32,494	8,090	24,065	1,211	1,345
1939.....	11,323	35,053	9,416	25,600	1,203	1,369
1940.....	12,805	38,079	10,100	26,128	1,268	1,457
1941.....	17,528	44,737	11,810	27,562	1,484	1,623
1942 ¹	22,825	54,465	12,922	28,578	1,766	1,906

¹ Preliminary.

² Tentative estimate, July 1942.

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

gard to labor costs—labor costs considered as 100 percent when the parity basis was established in 1914, but which as of today have doubled—it does not take much calculation to ascertain where the farmer will be if he has to farm under such conditions. I plead with the Senate to incorporate in the pending measure language which will make it mandatory upon the agency administering it to include farm labor costs in calculating maximum prices of farm commodities so as to assure the production of the food needed by our armed forces and by our Nation.

Let us not forget that the farmers of our Nation are fighting a real battle to win the war. They are not profiteers. All they ask is a fair return so that they can keep going. I contend that the farmers constitute one of the most patriotic segments of our Nation and we should by all means keep them going so that we can win our battle of production which is so essential and necessary for the winning of the war.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, during the course of my remarks this afternoon I said that in the event the Thomas amendment was defeated I would propose two amendments. I now ask out of order that these proposed amendments be printed in the Record and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. ELLENDER are as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ELLENDER to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to aid in stabilizing the cost of living, viz: On page 4, line 2, strike out all after the word "inequities" through the word "inequities" in line 13, as amended, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided further, That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes. In determining maximum prices for agricultural commodities all farm labor, among other costs, shall be included as an integral part of the production cost of such commodity and shall be taken into consideration in determining such maximum prices: *Provided further*, That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing."

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ELLENDER to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to aid in stabilizing the cost of living, viz: On page 4, line 2, strike out all after the word "inequities" through the word "inequities" in line 13, as amended, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided further, That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes. In determining maximum prices for agricul-

tural commodities all hired farm labor, among other costs, shall be included as an integral part of the production cost of such commodity and shall be taken into consideration in determining such maximum prices: *Provided further*, That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 895) to provide for the registration of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2725. An act to increase by \$600,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to remove certain limitations on the cost of construction of Army and Navy living quarters.

STABILIZATION OF THE COST OF LIVING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to aid in stabilizing the cost of living.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Hayden	Rosier
Barkley	Herring	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Schwartz
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Kilgore	Spencer
Brown	La Follette	Stewart
Bunker	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chandler	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	White
Doxey	Norris	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Willis
George	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed, printed in the Record, and lie on the table a proposed substitute for the pending joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be printed, printed in the Record, and lie on the table.

The amendment submitted by Mr. DANAHY is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. DANAHY to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to aid in stabilizing the cost of living, viz: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, the President is authorized and directed, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living; and, except as otherwise provided in this joint resolution, such stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. The President may thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to correct gross inequities and to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

"Sec. 2. Section 2 (f) and section 3 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 3. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this joint resolution; and may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by this joint resolution through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct. The President may not under the authority of this joint resolution suspend any law or part thereof.

"Sec. 4. (a) Section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by striking out 'June 30, 1943' and substituting 'June 30, 1944.'

"(b) All provisions (including prohibitions and penalties) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 which are applicable with respect to orders or regulations under such act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this joint resolution, be applicable in the same manner and for the same purposes with respect to regulations or orders issued by the Price Administrator in the exercise of any functions which may be delegated to him under authority of this joint resolution.

"(c) Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to invalidate any provision of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, or to invalidate any regulation, price schedule, or order issued or effective under such act.

"Sec. 5. (a) No employer shall pay, and no employee shall receive, wages or salaries in contravention of the regulations promulgated by the President under this joint resolution. The President shall also prescribe the extent to which any wage or salary payment made in contravention of such regulations shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purposes of any other law or regulation.

"(b) Any person who wilfully violates any regulation promulgated by the President under this joint resolution relating to wages or salaries, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000.

"SEC. 6. The provisions of this joint resolution and all regulations thereunder, shall terminate on June 30, 1944, or on such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President by proclamation, may prescribe."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement, and then I shall ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment.

The amendment pending before the Senate was offered by the Senator from New Mexico and myself jointly. The purpose of that amendment was to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the existing labor shortage on the farm and the trend toward food shortages. The amendment has already largely served its purpose, Mr. President, as indicated by telegrams which I have on my desk from all sections of the country, attesting to the fact that there is an existing labor shortage on the farms, and there is now a threatened shortage of food products throughout the United States. Already the Department of Agriculture has served notice that there will be rationing of meat products, especially beef products, in October, and I have before me a newspaper article, printed in this city, to the effect that next year, in all probability, there will be general food rationing throughout the entire country. So I think that our purpose in offering the amendment has been largely served.

To the end that we might have some agreement, and bring this debate to a close, this morning at 11 o'clock a number of Members of the Senate, mainly from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, met. At that meeting a subcommittee, consisting of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], was appointed to prepare what might be a compromise or the text of an amendment which we hoped might be acceptable to the so-called majority.

The committee worked on such an amendment and prepared and submitted it. It is in the nature of a substitute, and follows very closely the lines of the substitute which we understand may be offered, no matter what may happen on the vote on the pending amendment. The first few lines and the last few lines are the same as the suggested substitute.

The pending amendment provides that the basic parity formula shall be changed by the addition of labor costs. That is mandatory. The pending amendment further provides that all labor costs on the farm shall be considered, which means the labor that is hired, the labor of the farmer himself, and the labor of

his wife and children, if they perform labor. We propose as a substitute that the existing formula by which the parity prices are arrived at shall not be disturbed but that this limitation shall apply only for the duration of the war. That is change No. 1.

Change No. 2 is that, in place of directing the administrator of the act to consider all labor costs, which would include, as I have said, the labor to be hired, the labor of the farmer himself, and the labor of his wife and children, we simply say, "including farm labor," and leave it to the administrator to determine whether or not all labor shall be considered or whether merely hired labor shall be considered, or whether hired labor and the farmer's labor shall be considered. It leaves it flexible. We thought that by making these concessions we might secure an agreement, but apparently no agreement is forthcoming.

I want the RECORD to show that on last Wednesday I asked for a vote on the pending amendment, and I requested the Chair to announce the decision. After a show of hands, the Chair announced that a sufficient number had seconded the demand to make mandatory a yeas-and-nays vote, and so the yeas and nays are now ordered on the pending amendment.

I also want the RECORD to show that the proponents of the amendment are not responsible and have not been responsible for any delay which may have ensued. We were ready to vote then; we were ready to vote on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. Today is Monday, and we are ready to vote now. So, in order that we may have this compromised suggestion on the desk of the Presiding Officer, I offer the amendment, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD, that it be printed in the usual form, and that the amendment, as printed, lie on the table.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed in the RECORD, printed in the usual form, and lie on the table.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma is as follows:

On page 4, line 2, strike out all after the word "Inequities" through the word "Inequities" in line 13, as amended, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Provided further, That (1) in fixing maximum prices for any agricultural commodity or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, all productive costs of such agricultural commodity, including labor, shall be reflected in any such maximum prices so established or fixed by virtue of any authority contained in this joint resolution; (2) in fixing maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing, and (3) modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity or commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase or maintain the production of such commodity for war purposes."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Inasmuch as the Senator from Oklahoma has modified his own amendment—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a point of order. I have not offered to modify my amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is it the Senator offers to do?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. May I offer the proposal sent to the desk by the Senator from Oklahoma as a modification of his amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. That would not be in order. The amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma is already an amendment in the second degree, and all that can happen about it is that he might modify his own amendment, but neither the Senator from New Mexico, nor I, nor any other Senator can offer an amendment to that amendment or a substitute for it and have it pending as a substitute or as an amendment. I was trying to ascertain what the Senator from Oklahoma really did. He has not offered the proposal as a modification of his own amendment. What has he done to it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I simply offered an amendment and asked that it be printed in the RECORD, printed in the usual form, and lie on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then it is an amendment to the bill, and not an amendment or a substitute for or modification of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I made no reference to it as a modification of the amendment pending before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not have any effect unless the Senator offers it, as he has a right to do, as a modification of his own amendment. I am trying to be clear about what the Senator has done. He has not done anything to his amendment as it is now pending, but he offers an amendment to the bill which he wants to have printed and lie on the table.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If we could get an agreement, and this matter could be brought to a vote, I should be glad, under the rules, to modify my amendment as I have offered it, but I have not asked for that and have not done it, and unless we can reach an agreement I shall not ask for a modification of the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator cannot even modify his own amendment, unless by unanimous consent, now that the yeas and nays have been ordered on his amendment. So, I suppose that the status is that the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, as originally offered, is still the pending question upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered; and that any amendment, suggestion, modification, substitute, or any-

thing else along that line which may be offered now, is only for the information of the Senate and may be printed and lie on the table as an independent amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So we understand the situation. That still leaves the Thomas amendment as it is now before the Senate as an amendment upon which the Senate must vote before other amendments may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, because of the very able manner in which the Thomas-Hatch amendment has been presented to the Senate, I had not intended to speak, but after reading the editorial in the Washington Post Thursday morning, I felt that my duty to my constituents demanded that, with all the eloquence at my command, I resent in their behalf this wholly unwarranted and entirely contemptible attack upon certain Members of the House and Senate.

The editorial, in part, says:

If today the Senate follows the shameful lead of the House and also submits to the wishes of the farm lobby, it will constitute, on the part of Congress, an abdication of its legislative function that will be deserving of the strongest possible censure.

Let there be no mistake about it. Congress is on trial. It cannot bow to the will of selfish interests, whether farm groups or labor groups, without arousing the scorn of all decent patriotic Americans. And by failing to take adequate measures to halt inflation it will leave the President with no choice but to use his war powers to do that job.

Mr. President, this attack upon the farmers by one of the millionaire newspapers is typical of what has rightly come to be known as the kept press. Among the 284 House Members who dared to vote their convictions there are outstanding citizens; both Democrats and Republicans, whose patriotism and whose honesty I will match with that of any member of the staff of the Washington Post, from the publisher down to the janitor. Those 284 Representatives voted in favor of what is contained in the Thomas amendment. All of them, I believe, are interested patriotically and honestly in the welfare of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask that before any Member of this body vote against the Thomas-Hatch amendment he read, not what may be contained in any radical newspaper, or some paper which may be considered radical, but that he consider a report made by a department of his own Government, from which I read the following:

A recent study by the National Resources Committee indicated that in 1936 approximately 1,700,000 farm families throughout the Nation had an average income of less than \$500 a year. Nearly half of these families had incomes of less than \$250 per year. In other words, about 4,000,000 farm people were trying to live on an average income of about \$1 per week. This low income does not represent net income to these families, but it includes all feed and foodstuffs raised for home consumption, and represents gross

income from which rent and all farm operating expenses must be paid.

I ask any Senator in this body whether he himself would want to live upon an income of that size or have any of his relatives live upon it.

In a recent statement, Harriet Elliott, consumer commissioner on the National Defense Advisory Committee, warned that 45,000,000 people in this country are "living below the safety line right now," and called for action to wipe out undernourishment and malnutrition.

A survey of 100 needy farm families in two Georgia counties was made recently under the direction of the State medical school and the Farm Security Administration. This survey disclosed more than 1,300 health handicaps among these 100 families. Five hundred and seventy-five people in these families had 132 cases of rickets, 31 cases of suspected tuberculosis, 14 cases of pellagra, 288 cases of diseased tonsils, and a large percentage of hookworm. In addition, 360 of these people had defective teeth, and 124 had defective eyesight. That is more than one to a family.

Out of 109 women, 79 were suffering from tears resulting from neglect at childbirth, most of which could have been avoided by proper medical attention, and these 109 women also had 21 cases of suspected cancer. It is hardly surprising that these families had been failures and, in many cases, a burden on local relief rolls. A large number of the physical afflictions and diseases found among these people were the direct result of malnutrition. Many of these families did not know that they were sick. The communities in which they lived had thought them to be shiftless. The amazing thing is that these families were able to keep going at all as family groups, and not that many of them finally found their way to relief rolls.

During the past days I have viewed with apprehension the reaction of some of the majority leaders to the recent command for emergency legislation relative to inflation and prices and wages.

When we recall the famous quarantine speech the President made in Chicago, and think of all the mixed signals and fumbling on the part of the quarterback, it seems to me that this is the appropriate time for Congress to call time out and to go into a huddle and decide from now on a little more definitely what future plays are to be called, before we dilly dally and shilly shally around all over the field and lose the game.

The American people realize that this is no game of politics or sport, but rather a terrible game of war and blood, of the giving of life, and of the maintenance of our very existence as a nation.

I expected to call up later an amendment which would enable the Senate, in cooperation with the President, to deal fairly with agriculture, labor, and industry. The amendment simply asked the President to send the Senate the plan showing in detail the action he proposed to take on or after October 1. However, the distinguished majority leader has since told us that the administrative offi-

cers had shown the President Senate Joint Resolution 161, and that he approved it. So, in view of that statement, it is unnecessary to call up the proposed amendment.

Mr. President, of course Congress is just as mindful of the dangers of inflation as is the Chief Executive. Inflation is one thing, and the delegation of unrestricted and unlimited authority to control inflation is something entirely different.

Congress has in the past delegated free and full power to the President to regulate and control other things, and in all too many instances the people have suffered from the indecision, the muddling, the wrangling among the multitude of bureaus and bureaucrats. The overstaffed and overlapping administrative agencies, by issuing hundreds of flimsy, irresponsible, contradictory, Executive orders, which have the force and effect of law, have kept the people of this country in a turmoil.

Mr. President, let there be no mistake about the fact that after the last World War the farmer emerged as "the goat."

The compelling cry in the last World War to the farmers was, "Raise wheat." Literally, millions of circulars and newspaper articles pleaded with the farmer to plow up every available acre and raise wheat for the military forces. "Wheat will win the war" was the cry. Hundreds of thousands of acres were plowed up in my State alone by honest patriotic farmers to meet the Government's wishes and commands. No one knows this better than does the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who was intimately connected with the administration of the Food Control law administered by former President Herbert Hoover.

As was so eloquently stated a few months ago upon the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], during the last World War everything the farmer had to buy went up—harnesses, farm machinery, twine, fuel, and everything else. We all remember that the price of wheat went to approximately \$3.50 a bushel, and that the Food Administrator, Mr. Hoover, called in all the secretaries of agriculture from every State in the Union, and made a recommendation to President Wilson of \$2.26 a bushel for wheat at Minneapolis, which recommendation was adopted, and which left the farmer in North Dakota a trifle over \$2 a bushel.

Let me emphatically repeat, Mr. President, the price of almost nothing that the farmer bought was fixed by the Government, but the price of the wheat he had to sell was fixed.

I ask, where was the "kept press" then? Was there any protest on their part? Of course, with the farmer having to pay the prices which were demanded, with labor at that time going up to \$10 a day, there could be only one answer and that was bankruptcy on the part of the farmer. If I had the time today, Mr. President, I could call the roll of hundreds of farmers in the Northwest, yes, thousands of them, who, when the last

World War started, were well fixed, some of whom could even have been called wealthy but who, a short time later, were broke. Many of them died of broken hearts and their families were destitute for years. That was a part of the price paid by the farmers while 70,000 new millionaires were created in industry.

At that time, before the price of wheat was fixed, the Congress was told that those in authority would protect the farmer; they would see that he got a square deal. It was said that farming, with the millions of farmers dependent upon agriculture, of course, would be taken care of; it was said the farmers had to win the war.

When we look over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that time we find that the arguments made are startlingly similar to the arguments I have recently heard upon this floor, particularly the one by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], when he said, on page 7320 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Knowing the depressed condition from which farm prices began their rise and the struggle farmers have had for 20 years, I believe there is no question that if equity were all that we had to consider here, the farmer is entitled to still further increases in prices and income. Unfortunately, the equities of the situation are not all we must consider. The danger of inflation is a dynamic force which threatens not any one group, but our whole Nation. The welfare of the Nation must and should outweigh the interests or demands of any or all groups as we draft legislation to meet this danger.

That is what the opponents of the farmers said in the last World War, and it is significant that the "kept press" has approvingly quoted the junior Senator from Minnesota. However, the Commissioners of Agriculture of North Dakota and of Minnesota, both elected by the people of great farming States, do not agree with the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Four days ago I read into the RECORD the splendid letter written by the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Minnesota. I may also say that I read into the RECORD at the same time a telegram from the Commissioner of Agriculture and Labor in North Dakota, the Honorable Math Dahl.

Fortunately for the farmers of America we have a record showing the conditions of the farmers before the last World War, during that war, and since that time—a record prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture.

I hold that document in my hand. It is entitled "Index Numbers of Prices Paid by Farmers for Farm Machinery, Prices Received by Farmers for all Commodities and for Grains, 1910-42, Inclusive."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Index numbers of prices paid by farmers for farm machinery, prices received by farmers for all commodities and for grains, United States, 1910-42

[1910-14=100]

Year	Prices paid by farmers for farm machinery	Prices received by farmers for—	
		All commodities	Grains
1910.....	102	102	104
1911.....	101	95	95
1912.....	102	100	106
1913.....	98	101	92
1914.....	96	98	102
1915.....	100	98	120
1916.....	107	118	123
1917.....	126	175	217
1918.....	155	202	227
1919.....	161	213	233
1920.....	167	211	232
1921.....	156	125	112
1922.....	142	132	106
1923.....	146	142	113
1924.....	152	143	129
1925.....	153	156	157
1926.....	154	145	131
1927.....	154	139	128
1928.....	154	149	130
1929.....	153	146	120
1930.....	152	126	100
1931.....	150	87	63
1932.....	141	65	44
1933.....	137	70	62
1934.....	144	90	93
1935.....	148	108	103
1936.....	149	114	108
1937.....	154	121	126
1938.....	160	95	74
1939.....	157	92	72
1940.....	158	98	85
1941.....	161	122	96
1942-June August.....	164	163	115

¹ Excluding tractors.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the first column is "Prices paid by farmers for farm machinery, exclusive of tractors"; the second column is "Prices received by farmers for all commodities"; and the third column is headed "Prices received by farmers for grains."

In 1910, which was, of course, before the World War, note that the index number of prices paid by farmers for farm machinery was 102, and the prices received by farmers for all commodities was 102, and for grains 104. Note these figures well because the farmer then was getting an even break.

In 1918 the index number shows that the price for farm machinery had arisen to 155, that the prices received for all commodities was 202, and for grains had arisen to 227. In other words, the price on farm machinery had gone up a little over half, while the price received by the farmer during the war had doubled. The farmer had to pay a little more than one-half more for every piece of farm machinery he purchased during those years.

But what happened during the years after the war was over? Farm machinery stayed up where it was, while the prices received by the farmers went rapidly down, so that by 1941, last year, we find that the farmer was paying more for farm machinery than he paid at the end of the first World War, because the index number is 161, but for prices received by farmers for all commodities we find that instead of the index number being 202 it is 122, a drop of nearly a half, while the price received by the farmer for grains

dropped from 227 to 96. Think of it—from 227 to 96—the farmer getting far less than half of what he got in 1918. Even more significant is the fact that the table shows that during the worst depression years, for example, 1932, farm machinery and other things the farmer had to buy did not go down. In 1932 the index number for farm machinery was 141, a drop only from 155 to 141, while the price received by farmers for commodities dropped from 202 to 65, and the price received for grains dropped from 227 to 44.

Is it any wonder that, aside from the drought, the rust and the hailstorms, the chinch bugs and grasshoppers, and the scores of other things the farmer has to contend with, thousands upon thousands of farmers went broke and lost their homes? Yet during all this time the price of farm machinery and the things the farmer had to buy stayed substantially where they were during the First World War.

Mr. President, I wish to make clear that by no vote of mine will anyone ever again single out the farmer for punishment, and that is what is sought to be done now. I am proud of the fact that as Governor of my State during 1933 and 1934, by Executive decree by the proclamation of a moratorium, I saved thousands upon thousands of farmers their homes in North Dakota.

Already the attitude of the administration in attacking farmers is showing results. Already the farmers are getting out of the farm business as fast as they can get out.

I hold in my hand a copy of the issue of Thursday, September 17, of the splendid weekly newspaper operated by the farmers of Mountrail County, known as the Stanley Sun. I call the attention of the Senate to the notice of the public sales, and will give three instances of them in chronological order.

The sale Wednesday, September 23, is on the Martin Grove farm, on the northwest quarter of section 9, township 157, range 92. The sale on the 24th is on the John Trovatten farm, 4 miles south of Palermo, and the wording of that public sale is significant. I will read it:

Having to quit farming, I will sell at auction on the John Trovatten farm, 4 miles south of Palermo, on Thursday, September 24, 42 head of cattle—16 milk cows, 7 steers, 1 and 2 years, 4 heifers, 2 years old, 9 short yearlings, 6 calves; 3 work horses, 2 colts, 18 hogs, 100 pounds and up. Full set of machinery, feed, oats, and hay.

The sale on Saturday the 25th is on the Stomley farm, section 20, township 158, range 91. I will read the list of property which was sold there:

Twenty head Holstein cattle—9 young milk cows, 2 heifers, 1 year, 1 steer, 1 year, 8 spring calves, 3 head horses—1 gelding, 9 years old, 1 gelding, 8 years old, 1 3-year-old gelding; 100 chickens, 2 pigs, farm machinery.

Need I say more about sales when it is conceded that thousands of farmers are quitting?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Last week Minnesota newspapers carried a news item quoting Mr. Jones, Secretary of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, to the effect that after a survey of farm conditions in Minnesota it was learned that there have been more than 10,000 farm sales in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, during my illness last month I spent several weeks on a farm. Farm wages have gone up and up and up; and yet if we are to follow the opponents of the Thomas amendment the young boys and girls who work on these farms, any one of whom could be hired by a neighbor and receive good pay, ought to receive nothing for their work. The housewife, who gets up at 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning and slaves as only a woman on a farm must slave to keep body and soul together, is not to be considered. The owner of the farm who becomes prematurely old is to be left to die in the poorhouse. The terrific increase in wages of hired help is not to be considered either. Of course not. Such costs have not been considered in the past. Why should they be considered now?

Mr. President, history will record that the action taken in the House by both Democrats and Republicans rendered a tremendous service to the farmers of the country. Those men resisted the efforts of big business interests again to rob, wreck, and ruin the farmers. I cannot too highly commend the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] for his foresightedness, his patriotism, and his unfailing tenacity in seeing that the farmers get the square deal to which they are entitled. As for myself, I shall stand behind him and hold up his hands.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I have received a letter, written in longhand, from a farmer in Montana. The letter is from Mr. Alexander Truchot. He says in part:

I am writing you this letter in the hope that you will be able to save the livestock industry.

The President says that livestock prices are too high. You must remind him that the cost of raising livestock has gone up to so high a figure as to force many growers out of business. In this vicinity we have to pay from \$7 to \$10 a day for help when we used to be able to get it for \$2 or \$3.

I have received many similar letters, absolutely proving what the Senator says. The farmers are being forced out of business because of the tremendous increase in farm wages which they must pay at the present time. Farm labor costs from \$7 to \$10 a day, whereas it used to cost \$2 or \$3. It is simply impossible to pay such wages.

The other day I received a letter from a gentleman in New York criticizing my stand with reference to the Thomas amendment, and telling me how the people of New York could not afford to pay the prices they were having to pay for pork chops and beefsteak. Unless the people in New York who are now

complaining about high prices recognize the fact that the farmer must receive higher prices for his products in order to produce them, they will wake up some morning and find that they have no farm products to eat. They will have no pork, beef, or mutton to eat unless the farmer can afford to raise it.

Only the other day about 52 carloads of breeding sheep were shipped out of the State of Montana to the slaughterhouse, because the owners could not afford to keep men on the farms to take care of them.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Montana for his statement. The Senator from Montana is known all over the Northwest as one of the real champions of the farmer and the laboring man.

Mr. President, I have only the best of personal good feeling toward the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. I really like him; but in his enthusiasm for his cause he said certain things in his speech which I am certain he would not have said in a calmer moment.

From that speech I quote:

Then when the news of what was to be contained in the joint resolution went out, the trains coming into Washington were filled with representatives of the farm bloc. * * * Mr. President, it is a question of who is conducting the affairs of this country. Everyone knows that it is easy for a minority group to heat the wires, send us telegrams, call us by telephone, and fill our offices with mail asking that we resist a certain measure; but you and I know that we do not hear from the vast majority of the American people.

My telephone has not been ringing; my mail has not been flooded with inspired letters or telegrams, and although I have not been flooded with inspired letters or telegrams, and although I have not been standing around in the Union Station, I am entirely satisfied that the trains were not jammed with farmers coming down here to lobby. Farmers in my State, at least, would have neither the money nor the time to come to Washington. They are too busy trying to win the war, too busy trying to get the grain threshed, the potatoes dug, and the corn shocked.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I should like to read one paragraph from a newspaper printed in the far Northwest. This item is from the Capital Press of Salem, Oreg. The headline is:

Auction sales are warning. Farmers' trek to factories sounds dairy's death knell.

The article tells of the great number of sales being held in that section of the country. This is one paragraph from the news article:

Many of the auctions are being held on Sundays as the owners are already employed elsewhere and this is their only day off.

The point is that farmers do not have the time to have sales on weekdays. They must have them on Sundays so as to attract other farmers to their sales as possible buyers.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

I wish the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan to know just exactly who has been telegraphing and writing me. A telegram from the North Dakota Stockmen's Association reads as follows:

We strongly urge you to support the Hatch amendment to present pending price-control bill. We believe that in order to establish a just parity on agricultural commodities it is absolutely necessary to include agricultural labor in the base.

This association is made up of farmers and ranchers who raise cattle so that the American soldiers may have beef. I ask the distinguished Senator, have they not a right to telegraph their Senator?

The next telegram I received was from Hon. Math Dahl, commissioner of agriculture and labor in our State, a man whose business it is to be thoroughly acquainted with the situation of the farmers, a man who several times has been called to Washington to render service to his Government, a fine, substantial, patriotic citizen, an actual dirt farmer who has more than 100 head of cattle on his ranch in Emmons County, and a man of such ability that he has been made a director of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture. His telegram is as follows:

As official representative of all the farmers of North Dakota I urge you to support proposal to amend parity formula in price-control bill including cost of farm labor. Agriculture needs and is entitled to this protection to be on par with other industries.

I also received a telegram strongly supporting the amendment from O. E. Erickson, State commissioner of insurance, another loyal, honest, hard-working dirt farmer who has been a leader in the long fight for justice for the farmer.

I received a telegram from N. C. Norgaard, of Portland, N. Dak., which I hold in my hand, and which reads in part as follows:

Farmers getting 35 cents per bushel for potatoes, paying 8 cents for picking, 3 cents for trucking, which leaves 24 cents. Does this cause inflation?

Further on in the telegram he says:

Why take everything out of the northwestern farmers who are selling their grain at prewar prices but paying wartime prices for equipment, repairs, and wages.

A letter dated September 23 came from Hon. J. A. Coffey, of Jamestown, N. Dak., who was a district judge of our State for 18 years, a man of the highest reputation and unquestioned patriotism. His letter corroborates what the other messages have stated.

Another letter came from Hon. R. F. Gunkelman, of Fargo, N. Dak. Few men in our State know more about farming conditions than he does. He is an expert because of his experiences with elevators, dirt farming, and the grain situation. Two hundred farmers met in North Dakota last week and appointed Mr. Gunkelman to write this letter, which is three pages long.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in full in the RECORD so that Senators may read it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE SEED & GRAIN CO.,
Fargo, N. Dak., September 23, 1942.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: All of us living in the agricultural areas of the West naturally have been very much interested in the debate going on in Congress with reference to farm prices. We have watched the fight put up by the so-called farm bloc. We believe, however, that there is one phase of the situation that escaped the President's attention. It perhaps has not had the consideration from the Senate that should be given to this angle of the situation.

In the first place let me say that farmers are just as much concerned about winning this war and are doing all they can to bring about victory as well as any other class of citizens or perhaps even more so. But they are facing a situation which is really critical.

Last evening it was my privilege to attend a community meeting at Grandin, N. Dak., a typical agricultural village in the Red River Valley. At this meeting some 200 farmers were in attendance, discussing the situation with which they are now confronted. They delegated me to write this letter to you, setting forth the consensus of opinion brought out by this meeting.

You, of course, are familiar with that part of the Red River Valley. Grandin is a small town in the heart of one of the best agricultural areas in the Red River Valley. The community has consistently shipped close to a million bushels of grain annually besides shipping large numbers of livestock, potatoes, sugar beets, and other agricultural products. The average farm tributary to Grandin is just a little under a full section of land. Naturally farms of that size are confronted with quite a labor problem.

At this meeting last evening, the fact was brought forth that there would be 11 farm sales in that neighborhood this fall. I am going to give you specific instances of why these farmers are selling out and quitting the farm. These instances will demonstrate the point that these farmers wish to emphasize.

Hovachek brothers operate an 800-acre farm, growing grain, some potatoes, and feeding a considerable amount of livestock each year. These men are in their late thirties. About 18 years ago they left North Dakota and went into the lumber industry on the Pacific coast. They became proficient in handling crews in the lumber woods. Four years ago their father died and they came back to operate the farm for their mother. This year they had in over 500 acres of grain of all kinds. They had an exceptionally good crop. Weather conditions have been very bad this fall and labor conditions still more serious.

In talking with them they pointed out that on account of damaged grain they cannot get loans on their grain. Their wheat is netting them from 93 to 94 cents per bushel. Their barley about 44 to 45 cents per bushel. Recently they received an offer from their former employers of \$600 per month to act as foremen in the lumber camps of the West. These men feel that they cannot pass up that kind of pay. They are having a sale and this large farm will lay fallow until the end of the war as they cannot get renters.

Another instance: You will recall the Brown farm which the writer and Mr. Thompson farmed for quite a few years until Mr. Thompson was killed in an auto accident. This farm has been rented to Jens Letness.

Mr. Letness not only is an excellent grain farmer, having in over 600 acres of flax this year, but also a big potato grower, growing certified seed. Two of Mr. Letness' sons have been called into the Army and he cannot get labor. He is well along in the sixties, so is having a sale and discontinuing farming all but a half section at Hillsboro.

August Grothman, with whom I think you are acquainted, has been farming 1,480 acres, is being forced to reduce to 440 acres. The rest of the land that he has been farming will lay fallow.

Hans Anderson, a fairly young man, who has had considerable flying experience, has been farming a section and a half of land, is having a sale and quitting the farm and has a job ferrying planes across country.

I could go on and cite instance after instance, not only in that neighborhood but in every community in the Red River Valley. The point that we are trying to bring out is this: A farmer is not so much concerned about the price that he gets for his product, although damaged wheat bringing from 85 to 93 cents and on which the farmer cannot get a loan does not pay big returns when the farmer has to pay \$6 a day for labor when he can get that labor.

War industries paying extremely high wages are attracting the farm labor from this section as well as other sections of the West, leaving the farmers stranded for help. All of these farmers tell us that if they could get higher prices for their products they, of course, could pay higher wages and perhaps compete and hold some of this labor to the farms. But under present farm prices it is impossible for the farmer to pay high enough wages to keep labor on the farm.

What labor they do get is mostly old men that cannot give a full day's work or who are not competent workmen. Most of the farms are highly mechanized and it really takes good mechanics to operate this machinery. Thousands of the young men who were operating this machinery have gone into the Army and in most instances leaving the older men on the farms.

We are all interested in winning this war. I believe, however, food is highly essential to the war effort. It is true that just for the present we have large surpluses of wheat, but with the reduction in acreage that we can visualize, this surplus will disappear very rapidly. We need to produce large quantities of flaxseed, but this acreage will naturally have to be reduced. We need to feed and fatten large numbers of cattle, hogs, and sheep. But with the shortage of labor a very small percentage of the usual numbers of cattle, sheep, and hogs are being fed on Cass County farms this year. A year ago at this time there were hundreds of thousands of sheep in feed lots here in the Red River Valley. So far, but very few sheep have been brought in. Farmers are too short of labor to attempt a feeding program.

Some of your old Casselton friends, who have been feeding large numbers of cattle for many years past, have not a single head in the feed lot at the present time. Such men as Joe Runck, Senner brothers, Ralph Gromesh, and the Roden boys, with whom you are acquainted, have not put any cattle in the feed lot to date.

Either wages must be frozen at a level that will allow agriculture to compete or agricultural products will have to be put on a level that will allow the farmer to pay the wages that industry is paying. There is no other way out. I hope that I have made myself clear as I was delegated to bring this picture to you, so that you, in turn, can bring it to the Senate committee that is considering this whole matter.

We in North Dakota are just as patriotic as any citizens of the United States. The very fact that we have furnished more men per capita for the armed forces than most

States bears out this statement. But we are simply trying to put some cold facts before you so that some of these matters that are vital to agriculture may have due consideration.

We trust, Senator, that you will see that this information goes to the right people. I am sending a copy of this letter to Secretary Wickard so that he may have some idea how farmers in this area feel and also have some idea as to the problems they are facing.

Very sincerely yours,
R. F. GUNKELMAN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let there be no mistake about this matter. As I view it, every Senator voting either for or against the Thomas-Hatch amendment will be voting—consciously or unconsciously—either for or against the general welfare of the farmers of the United States.

To get back to the speech of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], to my amazement I heard him say—and it is reported on page 7409 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I then stated that I would be with the President, even at times when I thought he was wrong, because he is the Commander in Chief.

Mr. President, is that the kind of support that Franklin D. Roosevelt is entitled to receive at the hands of any Senator? Does not the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan really feel in that great big heart of his that in this matter the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are right and that the President is wrong, that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which voted 14 to 1 in favor of the Thomas amendment, is right and that the President is wrong, and that the House of Representatives, which voted 284 to 96, is right and that the President is wrong? Did the junior Senator from Michigan mean what he said when he stated in his speech—

I then stated that I would be with the President, even at times when I thought he was wrong, because he is the Commander in Chief.

Yet, upon reading the appeal of the Senator from Michigan to his colleagues, one is constrained to feel that loyalty to the President is superior to, and held above, his loyalty to the American people and his own conviction as to what is right and what is wrong.

Mr. President, in another part of the speech of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, he had much to say about the assistance given to the farmer by the present administration. It is easy to make such claims as that. I have heard similar statements made ever since I was a little boy. Every time a Senator, a Representative, or someone else goes looking for farmers' votes he tells the farmer what a great man the farmer is. The politician will go out and help milk the farmer's cows and will sit down at the farmer's table at meal time and will tell the farmer's wife what a splendid cook she is.

Mr. President, the farmer is a great man at the time when the politician is looking for his vote. How the politician loves the farmer at that time. And how

promptly, as the record shows, the politician forgets him once he is safely in office. So let us see what the record is.

Speaking as a North Dakota farmer actually operating a farm, I well remember when 5,000,000 little pigs were put to death. I remember when the Government agents took cows I had paid \$60 each for, drove them to a sand pit near Menoken, and shot them, and paid \$20 apiece for them.

How well we could use that pork and that beef now. But we were to have a new doctrine—not the doctrine so clearly enunciated by Joseph in the Bible, but the doctrine of getting rich by killing off our livestock; we were to have the doctrine of scarcity.

Next, our wheat acreage was reduced. Today a farmer in Cass County who has 640 acres of fine, fertile land is allowed to raise approximately 141 acres of wheat.

We had too much wheat in North Dakota—far too much wheat; and we were told that we should let our fine black soil lie idle. But at the very time when the Government was paying our farmers not to raise wheat in North Dakota, its agents went to barren places in other States and put in great irrigation projects costing millions of dollars. For what purpose? To raise wheat.

Strange as it may seem to us, at the very time when farmers were told not to raise wheat or cattle, hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat were imported from Canada, and trainloads of cattle purchased from Canadian farmers were imported into our country. That was to the north of us. It was said that the farmers would have to take care of our neighbor to the north.

Mr. President, most of us are only too familiar with the good-neighbor policy applied to countries to the south of us. We all know about Argentine beef—Argentine beef that in 1933, 1934, and 1935 was imported and sold by the packers all over the United States, while our Government was shooting our \$60 cattle and giving us \$20 a head for the carcasses.

Mr. President, what is the situation today in the Northwest? During the last World War the price of wheat in North Dakota was not only put down to \$2 a bushel but under a regulation which was promulgated if the wheat contained a certain amount of foul weeds or had a certain moisture content it went into a lower grade. Of course, all of us agree that to a certain point that is all right, but in the last World War the Secretary of Agriculture established, as I remember, 56 different grades of wheat. The regulation provided that the different grades had to be kept in different bins, so that the average elevator operator who purchased grain in North Dakota, and whose elevator had only 11 bins, had the farmer at his mercy. The elevator operator could pay what he chose to pay. When the farmer brought the grain to the elevator the operator would say, "I am sorry; I cannot take it. I have only 11 bins, and your wheat is not the kind of grain that can go into any one of those, because I already have 11 grades in the bins." The situation became so bad that, as attorney general of the

State, I appealed to Herbert Hoover, Food Commissioner, for relief. He said he would send someone out to look into the matter. At about that time another regulation was issued, providing that if the farmer did not sell his wheat within 30 days after threshing it the Government could step in and take it over at whatever price it thought best. I mention those regulations, Mr. President, because by the substitute measure which is being brought up an attempt is being made to do exactly what was done in the last World War: to have someone not elected by the people—some board—make the rules.

So in the town of Baldwin, N. Dak., a local food administrator named O. W. Roberts grabbed 2,000 bushels of wheat which a farmer held 2 or 3 days longer than the regulation prescribed, and—believe it or not—that wheat was sold for \$1 a bushel, although at Minneapolis it would have sold for \$2.26 a bushel.

I promptly arrested the elevator manager who bought it, the elevator man who sold it, and the county food administrator. After those arrests were made, I received a telegram from Herbert Hoover saying that North Dakota was dominated by "Reds and radicals," and that he "was sending Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT, son of President Taft, his assistant, to appear in court for the elevator men and the county food administrator."

Sure enough, a few days later the present distinguished senior Senator from Ohio appeared upon the scene in North Dakota.

The senior Senator from Ohio is a reasonable man; and when he made his investigation he not only helped see to it that the farmer who had been robbed got \$2.26 a bushel for his wheat, but for 3 days he and I drove all over the prairies in North Dakota investigating the wheat situation, and between us we finally secured a complete revision of the entire grading system. Instead of having 56 grades, as I recall the number, they were reduced to 10. However, in the meantime the farmers had been mulcted, just as they are being robbed today under the present administration.

Today there is no real grain regulation in the Northwest. Elevator operators can pay what they please. The State commissions have no authority because, owing to the war, the Federal Government has taken charge.

To show exactly what is taking place, I hold in my hand two elevator slips.

This grain was hauled in by A. F. Teigen, a farmer of Moorhead, Minn., who owns some land in North Dakota. He hauled in this barley on the first slip, and it amounted to 164 bushels and 28 pounds, and the elevator man docked him—how much do you suppose, Mr. President—15 bushels, or about 9 percent of his crop. When Mr. Teigen protested he was informed, "We can pay what we please; we are not regulated by anybody." Then Mr. Teigen took the next load, out of the same field, threshed at the same time, to an elevator at Harwood, N. Dak., and although he had 171 bushels and 42 pounds in that load he was docked only 3 bushels and 16 pounds. In other words,

this farmer was robbed of 12 bushels of barley on the first load.

Mr. President, all the elevator men in North Dakota are not crooks. The overwhelming majority of them are honest. But I want the Senate to know how the administration is bungling its job in behalf of the farmers of the Northwest; how grain bins, which it was known away back last April would be needed in North Dakota to store grain, even now have not been furnished; how millions of bushels of wheat are piled upon the ground; and how, even when grain bins were furnished, the farmers were mulcted and made to pay \$265 apiece for certain grain bins, while private individuals built better bins, holding the same amount of bushels, for \$215.

I call the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan to the great surplus of wheat about which we have been hearing so much. The farmer could not get a decent price, they said, a few years ago because of the tremendous surplus of grain. We were told in the Northwest to feed the grain to the hogs and the cattle.

At the same time a report had already been made by the Department of Agriculture stating that synthetic rubber could be produced from this grain. Why was it not done? Our wheat at that time was being sold for 24 cents a bushel, our rye for 11 cents, our oats for 7 cents, and potatoes could not be given away for the digging. Why were not these products of the farmers used to manufacture rubber as the report of the United States Department of Agriculture, dated in 1938, said could be done? We know the answer. We know that from 1930 to date many foreign countries, according to the report of the United States Government itself, were making rubber from grains. I have the document before me. Away back in 1930 a number of foreign countries were making rubber from alcohol derived from grain. On page 112 the document tells about Germany doing it, and also France, Italy, Austria, England and Ireland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, Australia, Japan, the Philippine Islands, Cuba, Chile, Panama, Peru, Brazil, Angola and Mozambique, the Union of South Africa. That was away back years ago. The document to which I have referred was published by the United States Department of Agriculture. It is miscellaneous publication No. 327, entitled "Motor Fuels From Farm Products." The matter to which I have referred is found on pages 112 to 117, and the date of publication was December 1938.

Mr. President, during the course of the debate on this amendment there have been whisperings in the cloakrooms and on the floor about communism, stimulated no doubt by the report Representative DRES made to the House of Representatives the day after the House had voted so overwhelmingly in favor of this amendment. In his report Mr. DRES had much to say about communism and by indirection tried to smear the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America with the tinge of communism

because they had received the sum of \$22,500 from the Robert Marshall Foundation. Of course, Mr. Marshall was not a Communist; nor was any member of his family a Communist.

On the board of trustees of the Robert Marshall Foundation is Mr. Gardner Jackson, whom Mr. DIES accuses of being a Communist. So by accusing Mr. Jackson of being a Communist, Mr. DIES assumes that any organization benefiting from the Robert Marshall Foundation is a priori communistic. That is as close as Mr. DIES gets to involving that splendid farm organization with communism.

Mr. President, I do not know the Honorable James Patton, national president of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, but it will be remembered that the distinguished Senator from Michigan read into the record a letter from Mr. Patton opposing the Thomas amendment which I am supporting. That simply means that, so far as this one particular measure is concerned, Mr. Patton and I do not agree. However, I am certain that every Senator will agree that Mr. Patton has just as much right to express his views upon this amendment as has Mr. O'Neal, Mr. Goss, Mr. Holman, or anyone else. Furthermore, because Mr. Patton does not happen to agree with the other three high-ranking farm officials on this does not in the slightest measure mitigate against him. I am told he is a gentleman of the highest caliber. As I said before, I have never met him, but I resent, with all the power at my command, what the junior Senator from Michigan said about all these gentlemen. I resent the statement intimating that they were not real farmers. Every Senator upon this floor knows that the leader of every one of these farm organizations, Mr. O'Neal, Mr. Goss, Mr. Holman, and Mr. Patton all have come up in the democratic way and that everyone has been a dirt farmer.

Surely if there were the faintest tinge of communism in the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union it would manifest itself in one of its component parts, of which the North Dakota Farmers Union is one. I believe I know considerable about the Farmers Union in North Dakota. I am personally well acquainted with every one of its officials; I know its employees and I believe I know the overwhelming majority of the 25 or 30 thousand families who are members of the North Dakota Farmers Union.

The farmers of North Dakota are proud of their membership in the Farmers Union, and I can assure the Senate that the farmers of North Dakota are not only intensely patriotic American citizens, but are naturally inclined to be capitalists rather than serfs or slaves.

Furthermore, the majority of the members of the Farmers Union belong to a nonpolitical organization known as the Nonpartisan League, an organization of farmers and laborers and small businessmen who meet every 2 years to endorse candidates on the Republican, Democratic, or independent ticket. Because of the underhanded attempt to make it appear that the Farmers Union has some

indirect connection with the Communists, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in 1936 the Non-Partisan League, in open meeting, expelled from its convention in Bismarck, one of the delegates because he admitted he was a Communist.

Far more significant is the direct action taken by the people of North Dakota in regard to communism. Owing to the high-handed policies of the reactionaries, so well illustrated in this city by the Washington Post in its editorial last Thursday, the farmers, laborers, and small businessmen of North Dakota were subjected, during the depression, to the most merciless and cruel foreclosures, not only at the hands of the North Dakota bankers, but even the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, a department of our own Federal Government, joined. Of course, big insurance companies from the East, and rich mortgage holders from everywhere, also joined in the nefarious practice of taking the land and the chattels from the poor farmers and working men. For example, in one small town alone there were 34 orders of eviction brought against laborers because they could not pay their rent, and the families were thrown out on the street. Of course, treating people in that way brought about communistic attitudes there, as it would and will anywhere else. So, in the 1932 election, following several years of that kind of treatment, 5,000 farmers and laborers voted the Communist ticket in North Dakota, and one of the men whom I opposed for the governorship received approximately 5,000 votes in November 1932, running on the Communist ticket.

In North Dakota we did not do as some other States have done, namely, pass a law prohibiting a Communist column on the ballot. On the contrary, we had an investigation made to find out why a man or woman would vote the Communist ticket, and it did not take us long to discover the reasons. We found the chief reasons were hunger, want, and suffering—reasons enough to make people vote almost any kind of a ticket.

In 1933 a hunger march was organized to march upon the capitol in Bismarck. It was headed by a man known as "Red Flag" Taylor, from Plentywood, Mont. If North Dakota had had a reactionary party in control, those hungry marchers might have been treated the way the soldiers were when they marched on Washington demanding the soldiers' bonus. Instead of that, we met the marchers about 25 miles from Bismarck; we provided food and beds for roughly 1,000 people and then we gave them a chance to talk. As Governor, I called a joint session of the legislature and requested that these people be permitted to take as long to air their grievances as they felt necessary.

At the end of 36 hours they had told us what was wrong with the State government, and we promptly proceeded to do something about it. The result was that 2 years later, there were not 5,000 votes for the Communist Party, but only 1,100, and 2 years after that, the same man running for Governor on the Com-

munist ticket polled slightly over 300 votes. Since this was not half enough votes to give the party legal status in North Dakota, the party disappeared from the ballot.

Mr. President, I have always felt that President Roosevelt has sensed injustice to poverty-stricken people in a most unusual degree. I have always felt, and I feel now, that the President has done much for the underprivileged third of our population.

Mr. President, I want to make a statement now which to certain of the conservative Members of the Senate may sound radical, and perhaps even unwarranted. First, let us think back to the Republican National Convention, at which Gov. Robert M. La Follette dared to present his great Progressive platform, knowing full well that he would be called a socialist, a radical, a rabble-rouser, and an anarchist. It is interesting to note that the one Republican delegate to support Governor La Follette's platform at that convention was a delegate from North Dakota, the late United States Senator A. J. Gronna. We can all see now that if the Republican Party had adopted the La Follette platform at that time, there is every reason to believe there would have been no New Deal. It is also interesting to note that before Governor La Follette died he had the satisfaction of seeing 32 of the planks of that platform written into the law of the land.

Because of my deep faith in progress and in the ultimate effectiveness of democracy, and because of my certainty that the American people will always rise to protect themselves when they finally realize that special interests are grinding them down to abject slavery, I venture to suggest in the midst of this campaign by the "kept press" and the big interests and all that they represent to make the farmer look unpatriotic, selfish, greedy, and self-seeking, that it would be well for the Congress to remind themselves of what took place at the close of the last World War, and to realize that unless justice is given to the farmer, the laborer, and the small businessman right now, an economic and social catastrophe of much greater proportions will overwhelm us when this war is over. I desire to repeat that unless the problems facing the farmer are given effective attention, we are headed for an even greater collision than that prophesied by the junior Senator from Michigan.

Senators will recall what followed the last World War, when thousands upon thousands of farmers, workers, and small businessmen lost everything they had—property, jobs, health, morale, faith in the future—their all. As I have repeatedly said, neither the North Dakota farmer, nor anyone else, can exist unless he gets the cost of production plus a reasonable leeway. Unregulated exploitation of the many by the few must stop.

Because the farmers of North Dakota were courageously awake to the problems of the day many serious situations have been averted. For example, North Dakota had no soldiers' bonus march. Instead, we were the first State in the Union to

pass a soldiers' bonus law, and the North Dakota soldier boy received more money in cash than the soldier of any other State.

During the debate last Friday one of the Senators commented that the farmers were not organized. Mr. President, the farmers may be unorganized in other States but that is not true in North Dakota, thank God, and through being organized the farmers there have already accomplished what the farmers will ultimately accomplish in every State in the Union.

Do not think it was an easy fight in North Dakota or will be an easy fight in any other State. When the farmers took control of their own government in our State the kept press insultingly said that they were so ignorant that straw ought to be put on the legislative floors at the State capitol so as to make the farmers feel at home. They were ridiculed and sneered at then just as the radio, the kept press, and the big interests are ridiculing them, sneering at them now. Having won the right to work out their own problems in a free and open election, the farmers immediately found themselves in a head-on collision not with the President of the United States but with the big vested interests, the interests so well described by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] last Friday—the same interests which today tell the consumer so glibly that the reason why food prices are higher is that the farmer is profiteering, when, as a matter of fact, the farmer actually gets a very small part of the consumers' dollar.

In order to fortify themselves for the great fight ahead, the North Dakota farmers created the State Industrial Commission in 1916, consisting of the Governor, the attorney general, and the commissioner of agriculture and labor, to take charge of certain industries within the State. Incidentally, I had the honor, although still in my early twenties, to be elected attorney general that year, and so was the first attorney general to serve on that commission. I mention that only to indicate my personal familiarity with the program, and to pay tribute to that splendid group of American citizens who dared to see and to do.

At that time interest rates on first mortgages on farms were 10 and 12 percent. I have in my office an abstract showing that I paid 12 percent on a first mortgage on a piece of land in Morton County, N. Dak. The North Dakota farmers met that issue by creating the Bank of North Dakota, with a \$2,000,000 capital. When the law creating the Bank of North Dakota was referred to the people at a general election by the bankers and the kept press it was overwhelmingly adopted by the people themselves. Since its organization 24 years ago, the Bank of North Dakota, owned and operated and controlled by the State, not by the big vested interests, has been so successful that today it is one of the strongest financial institutions between Chicago, Ill., and Seattle, Wash., and has made a profit for the taxpayers of approximately half a million dollars each year.

I call the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa to the fact that

the North Dakota consumer pays a dollar less a barrel for his flour than is paid elsewhere. This is possible because North Dakota farmers organized their own State mill and elevator, and have been so successful that in 1939 in the handling of light-weight wheat alone they saved the farmers of our State \$12,000,000.

I call the attention of the Senators especially interested in insurance legislation to the fact that once aroused, the farmers of North Dakota did not stop with the organization of the Bank of North Dakota and the erection of the State mill and elevator, but they also went into the insurance business a long time before there was any Federal insurance. North Dakota insured the farmers against hail with the result that since the passage of that act the farmers of the State have been saved over \$40,000,000. Every public building and every school house is insured, not by some outside fire insurance company but by the State of North Dakota. So successful were we that the rates were cut more than half, and we have a surplus fund, as I now recall, of approximately \$2,000,000, all of it without one single dollar of taxation to the people.

In the same way the State insured against tornadoes and cyclones and in this they have been just as successful.

Likewise, Mr. President, every elected public official, whether local, county, or State who must furnish bonds, obtains the bonds from the State bonding department. We have been so successful in this that some municipalities have not had to pay a premium for years. A fund of hundreds of thousands of dollars lies in the Bank of North Dakota to be used if needed.

For 23 years these institutions have been a success and the United States Government has adopted a great many of the ideas originated by these farmers. The fact is we feel that the Democratic Party is greatly indebted to North Dakota since the laboratory work for the New Deal was being carried on there long before Franklin D. Roosevelt was even Governor of New York. Mr. President, what North Dakota has done is no more revolutionary than was the offering of that progressive platform to the Chicago Republican convention by Governor La Follette, of Wisconsin, 40 years ago.

I have ventured into this discussion today because I believe that from now on the common people are going to rule the United States of America. I believe they will follow a man whom they trust into any party and also that they will promptly leave him when they no longer find him worthy. I believe the time has come in America when the common people are no longer going to be frightened by the kept press or by smooth voices over the radio. I believe the time is here when the common people will no longer tolerate having their families deprived of the common decencies of life. I believe more and more farmers and laboring men will demand and obtain equal educational opportunities for their children.

As I now view the situation, unless the farmer of the Northwest receives adequate attention, the result after this war

is ended is going to be just what it was after the last World War, when thousands upon thousands of farmers lost their homes. As I have already demonstrated in the early part of my remarks, the North Dakota farmer cannot exist unless he gets the cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

During the last World War North Dakota led every other State in voluntary enlistments in the Army and the Navy, and, per capita, more North Dakota boys lie buried in France as a result of the First World War than boys from any other State in the Union.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude my remarks by reading a letter which I received today, written by a North Dakota farmer, a man whom I do not have the honor of knowing personally. The letter is short, and, in my judgment, shows that this farmer there upon the prairies senses exactly the problem we are face to face with here in the Senate. It is from Underwood, N. Dak., dated September 23, 1942, as follows:

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am very much surprised to hear that the President wants to freeze prices on farm produce. I think farm produce is not too high. It is not high enough. For 6 or 7 years we farmers have had very poor crops, and prices were low enough, too. We got into debt and had unpaid taxes. And now that we are getting on our feet a little again to pay up our debts and repair and reshingle old buildings, and so forth, we are, as it seems, told we are making too much money. And prices for farm produce have to be checked. How foolish this is. We shall produce more meat and eggs and dairy produce and flax, and so forth. Now, isn't it a better way to let increased production control prices? And increased production will surely keep prices down. We farmers cannot raise these things at the present cost of repairs, machinery, and labor help. In 1918 wheat was \$2 to \$2.50 per bushel. Harvest help was no higher than now—\$5 per day. And binders could be bought for \$250 that are now \$325 to \$350, and repairs high. I think where the most cost of high living comes in, of which some consumers complain, is after the foods are processed and sold by retailers. A pound of wheat sold by the farmer brings barely 2 cents. Turned into breakfast food it costs from 18 to 25 cents a pound. Likewise many other articles—vegetables, meats, and so forth, too much canned stuff bought. Why complain about farmers getting rich? Wheat, oats, rye, barley, and so forth, are still very low in price, and meat and poultry is not too high. In 1918 cream was 60 to 65 cents per pound. Now we get only 40 cents. Now, I hope you, as our Senator, will vote and talk against this unjust piece of legislation to be enacted against us farmers. We do not want to make money out of this war, but want to have laws for us to make a somewhat decent living out of our labor. I have lived in North Dakota over 40 years and farmed on a 320-acre farm, and know the income and expenses of farmers.

Yours truly,

R. E. BUSCH.

Mr. President, I do not know that I have heard any Senator upon the floor of the Senate who more clearly or more concisely has told exactly what the farmer of the Northwest is up against, than this farmer who lives on a half section of land at Underwood, N. Dak.

I say I would be untrue to the farmers of the Northwest, I would be untrue to the farmers, the laboring men, and the small businessmen who sent me to the Senate in Washington to champion their cause, if I did not rise on the floor of the Senate and, with all the energy, all the eloquence, and all the ability at my command, bring to the attention of the Senate of the United States the gross inequalities under which the farmers of the Northwest are now existing.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Kentucky if there is any hope of getting a vote on some of the pending questions before inflation entirely overtakes us.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a categorical question to which I cannot give a categorical answer.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Could the Senator express a hope?

Mr. BARKLEY. I had hoped that we might not only dispose of the pending amendment, but of the joint resolution as well, today. It has been necessary to rearrange the prospect because of conditions prevailing within the body of the Senate itself. The debate has gone on now until it is 25 minutes to 5. While I do not think we should recess now, in view of the number of Senators who wish to speak, the difficulty is that I have no derrick by which I can jack Senators up on their feet after 4:30 and induce them to speak.

Does the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] wish to speak now?

Mr. NYE. I should much prefer not to go ahead at this hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I thought. That is not an unreasonable suggestion, but of course if we continue each day to recess at 4:30 because no Senators are willing to speak after that hour, either on the theory that there are not many Senators present to listen or that so many speeches have preceded theirs that they do not get the headlines in the morning newspapers, we would not get ahead at a vote.

I am not making that suggestion with reference to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota; but frequently that is the motive which actuates us in determining whether we will speak at 4:30 or some other late hour in the afternoon.

Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot obtain a vote today. I hope we can have a vote tomorrow. Last Friday I announced that I wished to speak briefly at the session today as soon as the Senate convened. For reasons which were to me satisfactory, I yielded that position. I do not wish to speak at this time; but I wish to advise the Senate that I expect to seek the floor tomorrow as soon as the Senate convenes to say what I have to say on this subject.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I rise to suggest that I shall be quite happy to forego in favor of the Senator from Kentucky any privilege which might be mine, if a privilege accrues from having been scheduled to speak at this hour. I shall be glad to have him proceed when the Senate convenes tomorrow, and I am perfectly willing to follow him whenever he shall conclude his remarks.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is very generous of the Senator.

Mr. President, I would not undertake at this time to obtain an agreement as to when we shall vote tomorrow or to limit debate. However, I hope that tomorrow we can dispose not only of this amendment but the entire joint resolution. I take occasion to say that I have a feeling that the country is growing impatient that Congress does not act. The longer we delay a vote on this matter the more impatient the country will become.

When I speak on this measure I wish to discuss the question which was involved in the President's message, revolving around the fixing of October 1 as a date on which or before which he hoped that legislation might be passed.

Therefore, under the circumstances, I suppose we shall have to take a recess. I wonder if it would be possible to agree to meet an hour earlier tomorrow. Would that be satisfactory to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it had occurred to me earlier in the day that that might be the solution of the problem. There will be no committees in session tomorrow. Personally—I can speak only for myself—I should prefer to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. I always like to have the cooperation and approval of the Senator from Oregon. With that suggestion on his part, when the Senate finishes its business today I shall move that it take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. That is quite agreeable to me.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a convention, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

William F. Jackson, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at The Dalles, Ore. (reappointment); and

Paul B. Witmer, of California, to be register of the land office at Los Angeles, Calif. (reappointment).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of

Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Yugoslavia now established in London.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Greece, now established in London.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas L. Hughes to be consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Garland Richardson to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH MEXICO MADE PUBLIC

On motion of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom and the following convention was made public:

Executive D, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Mexico defining the duties, rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities of consular officers of each country in the territory of the other country, signed at Mexico City on August 12, 1942:

CONSULAR CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

The President of the United States of America and the President of the United Mexican States, being desirous of defining the duties, rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities of consular officers of each country in the territory of the other country, have decided to conclude a convention for that purpose and have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

George S. Messersmith, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America in Mexico, and

The President of the United Mexican States:

Ezequiel Padilla, Secretary of Foreign Relations;

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, which were

found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

1. Each High Contracting Party agrees to receive from the other High Contracting Party, consular officers in those of its ports, places, and cities, where it may be convenient and which are open to consular representatives of any foreign States.

2. Consular officers of each High Contracting Party shall, after entering upon their duties, enjoy reciprocally in the territories of the other High Contracting Party all the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities which are enjoyed by consular officers of the same grade of the most favored nation, there being understood by consular officers Consuls General as well as Consuls and Vice Consuls who are not honorary. As official agents, such officers shall be entitled to the high consideration of all officials, national or local, with whom they have official intercourse in the State which receives them.

3. The Government of each High Contracting Party shall furnish free of charge the necessary exequatur of such consular officers of the other High Contracting Party as present a regular commission signed by the chief executive of the appointing State and under its great seal; and shall issue to a subordinate or substitute consular officer duly appointed by an accepted superior consular officer with the approbation of his Government, or by any other competent officer of his Government, such documents as according to the laws of the respective States shall be requisite for the exercise by the appointee of the consular function; provided in either case that the person applying for an exequatur or other document is found acceptable. On the exhibition of an exequatur, or other document in lieu thereof issued to a subordinate or substitute consular officer, such consular officer or such subordinate or substitute consular officer, as the case may be, shall be permitted to perform his duties and to enjoy the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities granted by this Convention.

4. Upon the death, incapacity, or absence of a consular officer having no subordinate consular officer at his post, secretaries or chancellors, whose official character may previously have been made known to the Government of the State in the territory of which the consular function was exercised, may temporarily exercise the consular functions of the deceased or incapacitated or absent consular officer; and while so acting shall enjoy all the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities that were granted to the consular officer.

5. A consular officer or a diplomatic officer of either High Contracting Party, a national of the State by which he is appointed and duly commissioned or accredited by such State, may, in the capital of the other State, have the rank also of a diplomatic officer or of a consular officer, as the case may be, provided that and for so long as permission for him to exercise such dual functions has been duly granted by the Government of the State in the territory of which he exercises his functions as a consular officer and to which he is accredited as a diplomatic officer, and provided further that in any such case the rank as a diplomatic officer shall be understood as being superior to and independent of the rank as a consular officer.

ARTICLE II

1. Consular officers, nationals of the State by which they are appointed, and not engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions, shall be exempt from arrest in such territory except when charged with the commission of an act designated by local legislation as crime other than misdemeanor and subjecting the individual guilty thereof to punishment by imprisonment. Such officers shall be exempt from

military billetings, and from service of any military or naval, administrative or police character whatsoever.

2. In criminal cases the attendance at court by a consular officer as a witness may be demanded by the plaintiff, the defendant, or the judge. The demand shall be made with all possible regard for the consular dignity and the duties of the office; and there shall be compliance on the part of the consular officer.

3. In civil, contentious-administrative and labor cases, consular officers shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the courts of the State which receives them. When the testimony of a consular officer who is a national of the State which appoints him and who is not engaged in any private occupation for gain is taken in civil cases, it shall be taken orally or in writing at his residence or office and with due regard for his convenience. The officer should, however, voluntarily give his testimony at the opportune moment of the trial whenever it is possible to do so without serious interference with his official duties.

4. A consular officer shall not be required to testify in criminal, contentious-administrative, labor or civil cases, regarding acts performed by him in his official capacity.

ARTICLE III

1. Consular officers and employees in a consulate, nationals of the State by which they are appointed, and not engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions, shall be exempt from all taxes, national, State, Provincial, and Municipal, including taxes on fees, wages or salaries received specifically in compensation for consular services, and they shall be exempt from all kinds of charges incident to the licensing, registration, use or circulation of vehicles. However, they shall not be exempt from taxes levied on account of the possession or ownership of immovable property situated within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions or taxes levied against income derived from property of any kind situated within such territory or belonging thereto.

2. The exemptions provided in paragraph 1 of this Article shall apply equally to other officials who are duly appointed by one of the High Contracting Parties to exercise official functions in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, provided that such officials shall be nationals of the State appointing them and shall not be engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions; and provided further that permission for them to exercise such official functions has been duly granted by the Government of the receiving State. The Government of the State appointing such officials shall communicate to the Government of the receiving State satisfactory evidence of the appointment and shall indicate the character of the services which will be performed by the officials to whom the exemptions are intended to apply.

ARTICLE IV

1. Each High Contracting Party agrees to permit the entry free of all duty of all furniture, equipment and supplies intended for official use in the consular offices of the other High Contracting Party, and to extend to such consular officers of the other High Contracting Party as are its nationals and to such members of their families and suites as are its nationals, the privilege of entry free of duty of their baggage and all other personal property whether accompanying the officer or his family or suite to his post or imported at any time during his incumbency thereof; provided, nevertheless, that there shall not be brought into the territories of either High Contracting Party any article, the importation of which is pro-

hibited by the law of such High Contracting Party, until requirements in accordance with the appropriate law have been duly met.

2. The exemptions provided in paragraph 1 of this Article shall apply equally to other officials who are duly appointed by one of the High Contracting Parties to exercise official functions in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, provided that such officials shall be nationals of the State appointing them. The Government of the State appointing such officials shall communicate to the Government of the receiving State satisfactory evidence of the appointment and shall indicate the character of the services which are to be performed by the officials to whom the exemptions are intended to apply.

3. It is understood, however, that the exemptions provided in this Article shall not be extended to consular officers or other officials who are engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State to which they have been appointed or in which they exercise their functions, save with respect to Governmental supplies.

ARTICLE V

1. Consular officers may place over the outer door of their respective offices the arms of their State with an appropriate inscription designating the nature of the office, and they may place the coat of arms and fly the flag of their State on automobiles employed by them in the exercise of their consular functions. Such officers may also fly the flag of their State on their offices, including those situated in the capitals of the respective countries. They may likewise fly such flag over any boat or vessel employed in the exercise of the consular functions.

2. The quarters where consular business is conducted, correspondence to which the official seal of the consulates is affixed, and the archives of the consulates shall at all times be inviolable, and under no pretext shall any authorities of any character of the State in which such quarters or archives are located make any examination or seizure of papers or other property in such quarters or archives or to which the official seal is affixed. When consular officers are engaged in business within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions, the files and documents of the consulate shall be kept in a place entirely separate from the place where private or business papers are kept. Consular offices shall not be used as places of asylum. No consular officers shall be required to produce official archives in court or to testify as to their contents.

ARTICLE VI

1. Consular officers of either High Contracting Party may, within their respective consular districts, address the authorities, National, State, Provincial or Municipal, for the purpose of protecting the nationals of the State by which they were appointed in the enjoyment of rights accruing by treaty or otherwise. Complaint may be made for the infraction of those rights. Failure upon the part of the proper authorities to grant redress or to accord protection may justify interposition through the diplomatic channel, and in the absence of a diplomatic representative, a consul general, or the consular officer stationed at the capital may apply directly to the Government of the country.

2. Consular officers shall, within their respective consular districts, have the right:

- (a) to interview and communicate with the nationals of the State which appointed them;
- (b) to inquire into any incidents which have occurred affecting the interests of the nationals of the State which appointed them;
- (c) upon notification to the appropriate authority, to visit any of the nationals of the State which appointed them who are imprisoned or detained by authorities of the State; and

(d) to assist the nationals of the State which appointed them in proceedings before or relations with authorities of the State.

3. Nationals of either High Contracting Party shall have the right at all times to communicate with the consular officers of their country.

ARTICLE VII

1. Consular officers, in pursuance of the laws of their respective countries, may, within their respective districts:

(a) take and attest the depositions of any person whose identity they have duly established;

(b) authenticate signatures;

(c) draw up, attest, certify and authenticate unilateral acts, translations, testamentary dispositions, and transcripts of civil registry of the nationals of the State which has appointed the consular officer; and

(d) draw up, attest, certify and authenticate deeds, contracts, documents and written instruments of any kind, provided that such deeds, contracts, documents and written instruments shall have application, execution, and legal effect primarily in the territory of the State which shall have appointed the consular officer.

2. Instruments and documents thus executed and copies and translations thereof, when duly authenticated by the consular officer, under his official seal, shall be received as evidence in the territories of either State, as original documents or authenticated copies, as the case may be, and shall have the same force and effect as if drawn up or executed before a notary or other public officer duly authorized in the State by which the consular officer was appointed; provided, always, that such documents shall have been drawn and executed in conformity to the laws and regulations of the State where they are designed to take effect.

ARTICLE VIII

1. In case of the death of a national of either High Contracting Party in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, without having in the locality of his decease any known heirs or testamentary executors by him appointed, the competent local authorities shall at once inform the nearest consular officer of the State of which the deceased was a national of the fact of his death, in order that necessary information may be forwarded to the persons interested.

2. In case of the death of a national of either High Contracting Party in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, without will or testament whereby he has appointed testamentary executors, the consular officer of the State of which the deceased was a national and within whose district the deceased made his home at the time of death, shall, so far as the laws of the country permit and pending the appointment of an administrator and until letters of administration have been granted, be deemed qualified to take charge of the property left by the decedent for the preservation and protection of such property. Such consular officer shall have the right to be appointed as administrator within the discretion of a court or other agency controlling the administration of estates, provided the laws of the place where the estate is administered so permit.

3. Whenever a consular officer accepts the office of administrator of the estate of a deceased countryman, he subjects himself in that capacity to the jurisdiction of the court or other agency making the appointment for all necessary purposes to the same extent as if he were a national of the State by which he has been received.

ARTICLE IX

1. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party shall within his district have the right to appear personally or by author-

ized representatives in all matters concerning the administration and distribution of the estate of a deceased person under the jurisdiction of the local authorities, for all such heirs or legatees in the estate, either minors or adults, as may be nonresidents of the country and nationals of the State by which the consular officer was appointed, unless by such heirs or legatees have appeared, either in person or by authorized representatives.

2. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party may on behalf of his non-resident countrymen collect and receipt for their distributive shares derived from estates in process of probate or accruing under the provisions of so-called Workmen's Compensation Laws or other like statutes, for transmission through channels prescribed by his Government to the proper distributees, provided that the court or other agency making distribution through him may require him to furnish reasonable evidence of the remission of the funds to the distributees.

ARTICLE X

1. A consular officer shall have exclusive jurisdiction over controversies arising out of the internal order of private vessels of his country, and shall alone exercise jurisdiction in situations, wherever arising, between officers and crews, pertaining to the enforcement of discipline on board, provided the vessel and the persons charged with wrongdoing shall have entered territorial waters or a port within his consular district. Consular officers shall also have jurisdiction over issues concerning the adjustment of wages and the execution of labor contracts of the crews; provided that their intervention will have a conciliatory character, without authority to settle disputes which may arise. This jurisdiction shall not exclude the jurisdiction conferred on the respective local authorities under existing or future laws of the place.

2. When an act committed on board a private vessel under the flag of the State by which the consular officer has been appointed and within the territory or the territorial waters of the state by which he has been received constitutes a crime according to the laws of the receiving state, subjecting the person guilty thereof to punishment as a criminal, the consular officer shall not exercise jurisdiction except insofar as he is permitted to do so by the local law.

3. A consular officer may freely invoke the assistance of the local police authorities in any matter pertaining to the maintenance of internal order on board a vessel under the flag of his country within the territory or the territorial waters of the State by which he has been received, and upon such request the requisite assistance shall be given.

4. A consular officer may appear with the officers and crews of vessels under the flag of his country before the judicial authorities of the State by which he has been received for the purpose of observing proceedings or of rendering assistance as an interpreter or agent.

ARTICLE XI

1. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party shall have the right to inspect within the ports of the other High Contracting Party within his consular district, the private vessels of any flag destined to and about to clear for ports of his country, for the sole purpose of observing the sanitary conditions and measures taken on board such vessels, in order that he may be enabled thereby to execute intelligently bills of health and other documents required by the laws of his country and to inform his Government concerning the extent to which its sanitary regulations have been observed at ports of departure by vessels destined to one of its ports, with a view to facilitating entry of such vessels, provided that the captain of the vessel shall have requested of the consular officer

the issuance or visa of the appropriate bill of health.

2. In exercising the right conferred upon them by this Article, consular officers shall act with all possible despatch and without unnecessary delay.

ARTICLE XII

1. All proceedings relative to the salvage of vessels of either High Contracting Party wrecked upon the coasts of the other High Contracting Party shall be directed by the consular officer of the country to which the vessel belongs and within whose district the wreck may have occurred, or by some other person authorized for such purpose by the law of such country and whose identity shall be made known to the local authorities by the consular officer.

2. The local authorities of the receiving State shall immediately inform the consular officer, or the other authorized person to whom reference is made in the foregoing paragraph, of the occurrence, and shall in the meantime take all necessary measures for the protection of persons and the preservation of the wrecked property. Such authorities shall intervene only to maintain order, to protect the interests of the salvors, if the salvors do not belong to the crew of the wrecked vessel, and to ensure the execution of the arrangements which shall be made for the entry and exportation of the salvaged merchandise, such merchandise not to be subjected to any customs charges unless intended for subsequent consumption in the country where the wreck has occurred.

3. When the wreck occurs within a port, there shall be observed also those arrangements which may be ordered by the local authorities with a view to avoiding any damage that might otherwise be caused thereby to the port and to other ships.

4. The intervention of the local authorities shall occasion no expense of any kind to the owners or operators of the vessels, except such expenses as may be caused by the operations of salvage and the preservation of the goods saved, together with expenses that would be incurred under similar circumstances by vessels of the country.

ARTICLE XIII

Honorary Consuls or Vice Consuls, as the case may be, shall enjoy, in addition to all the rights, privileges, exemptions, immunities and obligations enjoyed by honorary consular officers of the same rank of the most favored nation, those rights, privileges, exemptions, immunities and obligations provided for in paragraph 3 of Article I and in Articles V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI and XII of the present Convention, for which they have received authority in conformity to the laws of the State by which they are appointed.

ARTICLE XIV

1. This Convention shall be ratified and the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged in the City of Mexico.

The Convention shall take effect in all its provisions the thirtieth day after the day of the exchange of ratifications and shall continue in force for the term of five years.

2. If, six months before the expiration of the aforesaid period of five years, the Government of neither High Contracting Party shall have given notice to the Government of the other High Contracting Party of an intention of modifying by change or omission any of the provisions of any of the Articles of this Convention or of terminating the Convention upon the expiration of the aforesaid period of five years the Convention shall continue in effect after the aforesaid period and until six months from the date on which the Government of either High Contracting Party shall have notified to the Government of the other High Contracting Party an intention of modifying or terminating the Convention.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Convention and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate in the English and Spanish languages, in the City of Mexico, on this 12th day of the month of August, 1942.

G. S. MESSERSMITH [SEAL]
E. PADILLA [SEAL]

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 29, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 28 (legislative day of September 21), 1942:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named passed assistant sanitary engineer to be a sanitary engineer in the United States Public Health Service, to be effective from the date set opposite his name: Omar C. Hopkins, September 5, 1942.

The following-named senior sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineer directors in the United States Public Health Service, to be effective from the date set opposite their names: John K. Hoskins, September 5, 1942.

Harold W. Streeter, September 5, 1942.

Harry R. Crohurst, September 5, 1942.

Harry B. Hommon, September 5, 1942.

Abraham W. Fuchs, October 9, 1942.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY SPECIALIST CORPS

James Anderson, principal personnel procurement officer, Field Service, Eighth Service Command, Army Specialist Corps, \$5,600.

Myron Samuel Falk, assistant to Chief of Ammunition Division, Ordnance Department, Services of Supply, \$6,500.

William Chester McDuffie, Director, Service Command, Field Service, Ninth Service Command, Army Specialist Corps, \$6,500.

Walter Alan Richards, Director, Fourth Service Command, Field Service, Army Specialist Corps, \$6,500.

Richard Pearson Strong, senior instructor in tropical medicine, Office of the Surgeon General, Services of Supply, \$6,500.

Percival Edward Foerderer, principal personnel procurement officer, Field Service, Third Service Command, Army Specialist Corps, \$5,600.

Edward Magill Gillespie, technical expert, Transportation Service, Services of Supply, \$5,600.

Charles Hartwell Maltby, assistant to district engineer, Engineer Corps, Services of Supply, \$5,600.

Henry Robert Norman, principal engineering consultant and executive assistant, Engineer Corps, Services of Supply, \$5,600.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Infantry

Athel Bangert
George Samuel Beatty, Jr.
John Thomas Berry
Frank Foster Boyle
Paul Collins Broun
Fred Hilton Cantrell
James Harry Cook, Jr.
Clayton Charles Craig
George Benedict Cullison
Lewellyn Clifford Daigle
Paul Edward Doherty
John Edmund Dwan 2d
Donald Calvin Foster
John Chambers Good
Harold Elmer Gould

LXXXVIII—475

Wayne Knight Harvey
Edward Norton Hathaway
John Hancock Hay, Jr.
Richard Wynman Healy
Roland Leo Kolb
Lewis William Leeney
Hollis Clinton Lewis
Haakon Lindjord
Cleveland Charles MacLane, Jr.
George William McCaffrey
Robert Simeon Moore
Willard Webster Morris
Edwin Allison Nichols
Leo J. Nielsen, Jr.
Donn Royce Pepke
George Edwin Pinard
Lloyd Joseph Ptak
Sam Jones Rich
Patrick Williams Riddleberger
Frank Jenkins Ryder, Jr.
Robert H. Schulz
Tom Crampton Smith, Jr.
Marshall Wolcott Stark
John Paul Stopka
Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr.
Joseph William Albert Whitehorse 3d
Richard Casper Wittmann

Cavalry

Boyd Lee Branson
James Alexander Caldwell
Duane Seaman Cason
Gerald Michael Dailey
Melvin Armand Goers
John Lafayette King
James Ray Spurrier
John William Summers
George Brent Vivian

Field Artillery

Edward Sterling Abdo
Grant William Allison
James Potvin Barry
William FitzGerald Brand, Jr.
Kenneth Paul Burns
Robert Edmondston Coffin
Gordon Omar Fraser
Eugene Pierce Gillespie
Floyd Lester Johnson
John Barton Lamond
Gordon Ames Moon 2d
John Scott Pollard, Jr.
Andy Walter Pribnow
Robert Clinton Taber
Ralph Emerson Vandervort, Jr.

Coast Artillery Corps

David Leonard Anderson
Francis Travers Burgess
Roland George Daudelin
George Howell Garnhart
Frederick Lorimer Graham
Harold Harley Haaland
James Paul Hamill
Adellon Franck Hanson
Ralph M. Johnson, Jr.
Alexander Hume Lucas, Jr.
William Yates McCachern
Clarence Arthur Powers
John Lawrence Sullivan, Jr.
Martin Fannon Sullivan
Herbert Alfred Waterman
Charles Goodwin Whitmire
Carlyle Philip Woelfer

Air Corps

Jack Holt Alston
Frederick Thomas Anutta
Russell Allen Berg
Fred Howard Bounds
Hubert Arthur Brandon
James Kay Briggs
Allison Cochran Brooks
Edward Longfellow Burge
Charles Dean Chitty, Jr.
Winton Ralph Close
William Slater Cowart, Jr.
Morris Charles Crossen
Jack Edward Cunningham
Thompson Faxon Dow, Jr.
Charles White Dunning
Howard Stanley Ellmore
John Scrimgeour Evans

John Lloyd Folts
Donald Millard Gordon
Donald William Graham
Byron Eugene Hall
Thrashley Moncrief Hardy, Jr.
William Donn Hayes, Jr.
Edward Herbes
Lawson Clifton Horner, Jr.
William Astor Hoy Jr.
Stanley George Huey
Charles Frank Jenkins, Jr.
Frederick Perry Jenks
Simon Howard Johnson, Jr.
Charles William Johnstone
Benjamin Anthony Karsokas
John Herbert Lackey, Jr.
William Archibald Lanford
Maurice Kurt Langberg
John Daniel Lavelle
Ernest Nils Ljunggren
Grant Mahony
George Max Manning
Jack Franklin Marr
Wheeler Martin
Stanley Eldred Matthews
James Thomas McKee
Melvin Almon McKenzie
Joseph Francis Mooney
Malcolm Arnot Moore
Frank Lee O'Brien, Jr.
Ralph Lorimer Oliver
Rudolph King Ort
Thomas Fleet Osborne
William Wolfe Ottinger
Earl Pease, Jr.
Paul Manning Person
Russell Arthur Porter
Robert Stephens Puckett
Clyde Asa Ray
Ray Edgar Soper
Robert Wayne Springer
Robert Bernard Sullivan
Earl Raymond Tash
Henry Sidney Taylor
Frank Purvis Thornquest
Clarence Spottswood Towles, Jr.
James Ernest Tucker
Henry Samuel Tyler, Jr.
Louis David VanMullen
Harry Lee Waesche
Peter Saville Walker
Alan White Wilder
William Allen Williams
James Hobson Williford
Earl Wilson Worley
Donald McLarty Wright

Corps of Engineers

Jack William Blair
Charles William Carr
Robert William Dalrymple
Harold Bernard Ellis
Ernest Thornton George, Jr.
Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom, Jr.
Thomas Jeffries Riggs, Jr.
Adrian L. Roberson
Allen Wightman Sanders, Jr.
Harold Jack St. Clair
Walton Orville Threadgill
Henry Dale Weston

Signal Corps

Charles Allen Carroll
Paul Clendenen Davis
Otto John Glasser
Earl Jay Holliman
Henry Benjamin Holmes, 3d
Vernon Cline Irby
Hale Mason, Jr.
Richard Anthony Wetzell
Robert Erskine Williams, Jr.

Quartermaster Corps

William Condy
Jack Bansley Falks
Robert William Foster, Jr.
A. H. Hamner, Jr.
Edwin Freeland Harlan
Herbert Henry Heumann
Clarence Edwin Jeffress

Finance Department

Jerome Bailey York

Ordnance Department

Kenneth Eufrey Berryhill
John Sherman Chambers, Jr.
Donald Wright MacFeeters
Paul Arthur Nilsson
Don Winton Ryker
Paul Alexander Simpson
Stanley Michael Smolensky

Chemical Warfare Service

Herbert Frederick Crecelius
James Joseph Gibbons, Jr.
Floyd Bayless Mitman, Jr.
Charles Richard Petticrew
John Henry Ritter
Samuel Adams Steere, Jr.
Lowell Edgar Thompson

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers of the Army of the United States (honor graduates), for appointment in the Regular Army:

*TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT**Infantry*

Charles John Anderson
Thomas Walter Anderson
Charles Junker Fite
Alpha Alsbury Fowler, Jr.
Lionel Raymond Fuller
William Bennison Fulton
Robert John Giesen
Joseph Hamilton Grant, Jr.
David Simuel Henderson
James Wilson Kerr, 3d
Kenneth Theodore Kofmehl
Turney White Leonard
Richard Theodore Lunger
Robert James Lynch
John Walter MacIndoe
Lawrence Glenn Mathews
Alfred William Owens, Jr.
Samuel Cochran Phillips
William John Regner
Raymond R. Rokey
George Reece Sedberry, Jr.
George Marion Seignious
Charles Benjamin Thomas
Louis Scott Torgeson
Albert Sidney Williams, Jr.

Cavalry

James Wilbur Gilman
Hughes Seewald

Field Artillery

James Marshall Cake, Jr.
William Ardery Campbell
Harry William Hale
John Benjamin Fancock
Donald Leroy Harrison
James Griffith Hays, Jr.
Lloyd Edmonstone Jones, Jr.
Lloyd Lorenzo Leech, Jr.
Max Adams Morris
Edward Clark Rose, Jr.
Alphonso Axel Topp, Jr.

Coast Artillery Corps

William Treloar Russell
Anthony Joseph Touart, Jr.
Molloy Clark Vaughn, Jr.

Corps of Engineers

George Arthur Austin, Jr.
Edward Cooper Bruce
Gerald William Homann
Frank Dixon McElwee
Hal Leroy Schröder
Edward Lee Waddell, Jr.
Victor Owen Wilson

Quartermaster Corps

Howard Ellsworth Sommer

Ordnance Department

Lawrence Shores Woolsey

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named honor graduate of a senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States:

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT OF INFANTRY WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

John David Hill

*APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY**TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT*

Louis Axelrod, Medical Corps Reserve.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named brigadier generals to be major generals in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 26th day of August 1942:

Julian C. Smith
Charles D. Barrett

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of May 1942:

Robert A. Downing, a citizen of Tennessee.
John S. Hudson, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 13th day of June 1942:

Robert L. Gillis, a citizen of Michigan.
Delmar M. Persinger, a citizen of Indiana.
Irving B. Hayes, a citizen of New York.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of July 1942:

Richard W. Mirick, a citizen of Massachusetts.

William J. Howatt, a citizen of California.
William G. Shoop, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

David S. Randall, a citizen of Kansas.
Norman C. Bayley, a citizen of California.
James W. Sperry, a citizen of Ohio.
Clayton S. Rockmore, a citizen of New York.

John L. Gifford, a citizen of New York.
Fred C. Eberhardt, a citizen of Kansas.
Henry V. Joslin, a citizen of Rhode Island.
Lyle K. London, a citizen of Texas.
Robert H. Daley, a citizen of Wisconsin.
Harry A. Hadd, a citizen of Minnesota.
Floyd M. Johnson, Jr., a citizen of Texas.

Paul O. Engelder, a citizen of Arizona, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of August 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 28 (legislative day of September 21), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Yugoslavia now established in London.

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Greece now established in London.

TO BE CONSUL GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Thomas L. Hughes

TO BE CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

W. Garland Richardson

*POSTMASTERS**ARKANSAS*

Lucy F. Harris, Earl.

COLORADO

Roy Staley, Arvada.
Walter E. Rogers, Berthoud.
George M. Griffin, Brighton.
Patrick H. Kastler, Brush.

James E. Adams, Englewood.
Agnes M. Padan, Fort Logan.
Carl E. Wagner, Fort Morgan.
Tom C. Crist, Haxtun.
Angeline B. Adkisson, Longmont.
Elmer M. Ivers, Loveland.
Grover C. Huffnagle, Ridgway.
Alta M. Cassletto, Telluride.

ILLINOIS

Joseph F. Speelman, Arcola.
Louise Rump, Beecher.
Luella C. Mosley, Blandinsville.
Carl J. Markel, Carpentersville.
Gilbert Jephtha Armstrong, Chandlerlerville.
Walter T. McCanna, Chillicothe.
Martin M. Dalrymple, Chrisman.
Dwight C. Bacon, Christopher.
John R. Reynolds, Colchester.
Vera E. Burrell, Cuba.
Philip G. Barron, Du Quoin.
Grover C. Norris, Effingham.
Charles R. Bowers, Elmwood.
Owen Kelly, Farmington.
Edward P. Malone, Gilman.
William Raymond Grigg, Mount Vernon.
Warren S. Smith, Norris City.
Floyd J. Tilton, Rochelle.
Joseph M. Ward, Sterling.
Samuel T. Duncan, Tamaroa.

MISSOURI

Birdie W. Brown, Forest City.

NORTH DAKOTA

Charles K. Otto, Valley City.

WASHINGTON

George D. Magee, Aberdeen.
Arthur H. Gerl, Wilbur.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we bless Thee for the joys and experiences which have come to us and for the interpretation of human destiny which Thou hast vouchsafed unto us. As the earth needs the night as well as the day and darkness as much as light, so we would thank Thee for affliction and discover richer meaning in the ministry of Him whose majesty moves the sun in the heavens and the stars in the skies. In this tragedy of international agony, He will arise over the charred ruins and unmarked graves, over the blackest barbarism of all times, and will bring healing in His wings.

We pray that each day we may be drawn by love and not driven by fear, looking not upon the truth with wandering eyes, but seeking to embody it in our daily conduct, giving action to irresistible resolution, conforming ourselves to the standards of Christian manhood, drinking the sacrificial cup for the sake of others. In this mortal life so confusing, we beseech Thee, dear Lord, to strengthen our courage and lift us to a plane of service where the tyranny of strife ceases and shall be overpast and where the lofty utterance of our pleading spirits is never silenced. To the glory and honor of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of the House of Thursday, September 24, 1942, was read and approved.